



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



C1363.130.20

Harvard College  
Library



FROM THE BEQUEST OF  
**JOHN HARVEY TREAT**  
OF LAWRENCE, MASS.  
CLASS OF 1862







**THEOLOGICAL WORKS**  
**OF**  
**HERBERT THORNDIKE.**



THE  
THEOLOGICAL WORKS

OF  
HERBERT THORNDIKE,

SOMETIME PREBENDARY OF THE COLLEGIATE CHURCH OF ST. PETER,  
WESTMINSTER.

---

VOL. III.

---

OXFORD:  
JOHN HENRY PARKER.  
MDCCCXLIX.

C1333.110.000

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
TREAT FUND

Aug 21, 1929

OXFORD :  
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

**TITLE OF THE WORK, THE SECOND BOOK OF WHICH  
IS CONTAINED IN THIS VOLUME.**

---

**An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England, being a necessary Consideration and brief Resolution of the chief Controversies in Religion that divide the Western Church: occasioned by the present calamity of the Church of England; in three books: viz. of**

- I. THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH ;**
- II. THE COVENANT OF GRACE ;**
- III. THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH :**

**BY HERBERT THORNDIKE.**

**London; Printed by J. M. and T. R. for J. Martin, J. Allestry, and T. Dicas, and are to be sold at the sign of the Bell, in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1659.**



OF THE

COVENANT OF GRACE.





## THE SECOND BOOK.

### CHAPTER I.

TWO PARTS OF THAT WHICH REMAINS. HOW THE DISPUTE CONCERNING THE HOLY TRINITY WITH SOCINUS BELONGS TO THE FIRST. THE QUESTION OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE. THE OPINION OF SOCINUS CONCERNING THE WHOLE COVENANT OF GRACE. THE OPINION OF THOSE WHO MAKE JUSTIFYING FAITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF A MAN'S PREDESTINATION, OPPOSITE TO IT IN THE OTHER EXTREME. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IT AND THAT OF THE ANTINOMIANS. THAT THERE ARE MEAN OPINIONS.

THE greatest difference that is to be discerned among those things that concern the duty of all Christians, consists in this; that some of them concern Christians as Christians; others, as members of the Church. For though all Christians, as Christians, are bound to be members of the Church (inasmuch as it is a part of their profession to believe one Catholic Church); yet their obligation to be Christians, being in order of nature and reason before their obligation to be members of the Church (because the very being of the Church presupposeth all that are members of it to be Christians), that obligation which is original and more ancient, must needs be presupposed to that which is grounded upon it. Of what consequence it may be to distinguish this difference in the matter of Christian duties, will perhaps appear in due time. In the mean, I shall freely say my opinion, that all the divines in the Christian world cannot more pertinently, and to better purpose, comprise the subject which they profess to be employed about, than by dividing it into that which concerns Christians as Christians, and that which concerns them as members of the Church. For mine own present purpose, it is evident, that the disputes which divide us, do concern either the state of particular Christians towards God, or the obligation they have to other Christians as members of the Church. So that the matter which I propose to my ensuing discourse is sufficiently comprised in two heads;

CHAP.  
I.

Two parts  
of that  
which re-  
mains.

BOOK one, of the Covenant of Grace<sup>a</sup>; the other, of the Laws of  
II. the Church<sup>b</sup>.

How the  
dispute  
concerning  
the Holy  
Trinity  
with Soci-  
nus be-  
longs to the  
first.

§ 2. I know it may be said, that the heresy of Socinus is of the number of those that have footing among us<sup>c</sup>; and that the principal point of it, concerning the faith of the Holy Trinity, comes not properly under either of these heads. And I deny not, that it is very dangerous for us; in regard of two points, that have so great vogue among us. The first is, the clear sufficiency of the Scriptures<sup>d</sup>: commonly passing so without any limits, that it seems to follow of good right, that what is not clear out of the Scriptures to all understandings cannot be necessary for the salvation of all Christians to believe; so that no man can be bound to take that for an article of his faith, against which they can shew him arguments out of the Scriptures, which he cannot clearly assail. The other is, that they<sup>e</sup> put it in the power of Christians to erect Churches at their pleasure (though supposing the faith which Socinus teacheth, and pretending to serve God according to the same), without communion with, or obligation of dependence one upon another, either in the rule of faith, or service of God according to it: wherein they may seem elder brothers to those<sup>f</sup> who have

<sup>a</sup> Book II.

<sup>b</sup> Book III.

<sup>c</sup> For John Biddle, whose tenets are nearly identical with those of Socinus, and who was the founder of professed Socinianism in England, see Toulmin's life of him (in the Unitarian Tracts, vol. iv.) and Wood's Athen. Oxon. His congregation was established at London in 1651.

<sup>d</sup> See above in Bk. I. Principles of Christian Truth, chap. ii. § 5. note g. That Socinus held the same doctrine, see his Epist. ad Andr. Dudithium, Op., tom. i. p. 502. a. folio, Irenop. (i.e. London) 1656.—“Resigitur exigit, nisi frustra scripti sunt libri sacri, ut quilibet interpretationem eorum, quoad salus hominis requirit, ex eo possit sumere quod ipsimet occurrit dum eos legit, ab omni alio affectu immunis, nisi eo, quo fertur ad salutem Divini numinis obsequio sibi comparandam.”

<sup>e</sup> They, i.e. the Socinians.—“Illud unum scire velim, cur hodie non liceat hominibus recte, quantum satis est, de religione Christiana sentientibus con-

venire, memoriam Christi mortis, ut jussi sunt, celebrare, communes preces ad Deum fundere, . . . aliquot ex suo numero certos homines habere, quorum hic aliis in Verbo Dei explanando præeat, . . . ille singulariter pauperibus ex communibus Ecclesiæ pecuniis subveniendi curam habeat; alii, ut omnia ordine ac decenter in cœtu fiant, provideant et curent; alii sint, quorum prudentiæ ac rerum divinarum cognitioni universus cœtus plurimum deferat, et quos idcirco tanquam senatum suum esse statuat; . . . velim, inquam, scire, cur hæc facere non liceat hoc tempore: . . . sive ejusmodi congregationem Ecclesiam appellare velis sive nolis, sive tales congregationes pares aut similes Apostolicis Ecclesiis esse concedas sive minus.” Socin., De Eccles., § de Senioribus Ecclesiæ, Op., tom. i. p. 352. a. See also his Epistola ii. ad Matth. Radecium, ib., p. 374. b.

<sup>f</sup> See above in the Right of the Church in a Christian State, chap. ii. § 24, notes p, r; and Principles of Christian Truth, chap. xx. § 10.

put the like principle in practice among us, though without supposing any other rule of faith, than that which every Church so constituted shall agree to take for the sense of the Scriptures. Now, how soon it may come into the mind and agreement of a Church so constituted to take up the profession of Socinus for the rule of their faith, I leave them that are capable to judge, if yet we have no experience of it. But I have observed by reading Socinus his book *De Christo Salvatore*<sup>g</sup> (one of the first, if not the first, of all the books whereby he declared his heresy), that being extremely offended at his adversary's opinion, he seems to have been thereby occasioned to fall upon another extreme, of denying the satisfaction of Christ, and so by degrees His Godhead; as the only peremptory principle to destroy the satisfaction of Christ, and by consequence as well that reason of the covenant of grace which the Church, as that which his adversary, maintaineth<sup>h</sup>. Conceiving then his error about the covenant of grace to have occasioned his error in the faith of the Holy Trinity, I conceive I shall handle the chief controversies in religion that divide the Church at present (according to the title of my book), though I maintain not the faith of the Trinity against Socinus; otherwise than as the maintenance of the covenant of grace, grounded upon the satisfaction of Christ (as that upon His Godhead), shall require. Another reason I had, because this heresy seems to be too learned to become popular among us, though branches of it may come to have vogue. For though there hath been but too much, either of wit or learning, employed

CHAP.  
I.

<sup>g</sup> *De Jesu Christo Salvatore, hoc est, Cur et Qua Ratione Jesus Christus Noster Salvator sit, F. Socini Senensis Disputatio*,—against Jaques Covet, sometime pastor of the French Reformed Church at Basle,—written in 1577 at Basle, but first printed in extenso and with the author's name in 1595, a small portion of it having been printed anonymously in 1592 (Pref. to the tract, *Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 118—120; *Bayl. Diction.*, art. F. Socin.). It appears from the same preface to have been the first detailed and elaborate statement of his heresies, and to have also been the first tract printed with his name, the work on a similar subject against Andrew Volanus

(printed in 1588) being anonymous.

<sup>h</sup> Socinus appears to take particular care in his tract *De Christo Salvatore* (which is wholly on the doctrine of the atonement) to avoid handling the subject of the divinity of our Lord: see e. g. *P. iii. capp. 4, 5*; *Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 197, b—204. a: just as in his tract against Volanus (written subsequently to the other) he takes pains to shew that his denial of that doctrine (which he is here occupied in disproving) does not involve his heresy respecting the atonement (*Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 375. b—376. a.). But the order of time in which the two heresies occur in his writings agrees with the supposition in the text. See also below, § 9. note u.



BOOK  
II.

in framing the Scriptures to the sense of it, in the chief points of Christianity<sup>1</sup>; yet is it hard to make the vulgar understanding, not only of hearers, but of teachers (such as these times allow), capable of that sense, to which they have framed the most eminent passages of the Scriptures, and [of] the grounds of it, together with the consent and agreement of the several points of Christianity among themselves, according to it. Upon this consideration, I charge not myself with the maintenance of the faith of the Holy Trinity, otherwise than as the consideration thereof shall be incident to resolve the nature of the covenant of grace, which is the first part of my purpose.

[The question stated concerning the nature of the covenant of grace.]

§ 3. Therefore (that a few words may propose many and great difficulties), from whence it comes, and what it is, that renders Christians acceptable to God and heirs of everlasting life; who, as men, are His enemies by sin here, and subjects of His wrath in the world to come: this I conceive to be the sum of what we are to enquire:—concerning, in the first place, that disposition of mind, which qualifies a man for those blessings which the Gospel tenders, upon that condition which the covenant of grace requires: and, in the second place, whether this disposition be brought to pass in us by the free grace of God, and the helps which it provides, or by the force of nature; that is, by that light of understanding, and that freedom of choice, which necessarily proceeds from the principles of man's nature.

The question of justification by faith alone.

§ 4. It is well enough known, how great dispute there is between them that profess the Reformation and the Church of Rome, whether a man be justified before God in Christ by faith alone, or by faith and works both (speaking of actual righteousness), or (if we speak of habitual righteousness) by faith and love. For though the whole garland of supernatural virtues concurs to the habitual righteousness of Christians,

<sup>1</sup> The *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, published in London in 1656, sq., in eight folio volumes, which contains the works of F. Socinus himself, of Crellius, of Schlictingius, and of Wolzogenius, "quæ omnia simul juncta" (according to the title-page) "totius Novi Testamenti explicationem complectuntur," may serve to shew at once

both the increase of the sect in England at that time, and the especial labour bestowed by them upon the exposition of the Scriptures. See also the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum* of the Socinian Christoph. Sandius, which contains a copious list of Socinian commentators (among others) during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

which is universal to all objects and actions; yet, seeing the reason of them all is derived from that which faith believeth, and the intent of all referred to that service of God which love constraineth, where faith and love are named, there the rest may well be understood. Whether faith alone therefore, or faith and love, so much the parties must, in despite of them, remain agreed in,—that there is some disposition or act of man's mind, required by the covenant of grace, as the condition that qualifyeth a man, at least for so much of that promise which the Gospel tendereth, as justification importeth. But this being supposed and granted, it may and must be disputed, in what consideration it qualifyeth for the same: which is, to make short, whether the inward worth of that disposition, whatsoever it shall prove to be, oblige Almighty God to reward it with that which the Gospel promiseth; or whether, in consideration of the obedience of Christ, performed in doing the message which He undertook, of reconciling man unto God, He hath been pleased to promise that reward, which is without comparison more than can be due to that disposition which He requires as the condition to qualify us for the promise.

§ 5. Here must I relate the position of the Socinians concerning the intent of Christ's coming:—not to purchase at God's hands those helps of grace which enable Christians to become qualified for the promise which the Gospel tendereth, which the Church<sup>k</sup> (with St. Augustine<sup>l</sup> in the dispute with the Pelagians) calls therefore “the grace of Christ:”—not to reconcile us to God, in the nature of a meritorious cause, His obedience being the consideration for which God accepteth that disposition, which qualifies us for the promise of the Gospel as the condition upon which He tenders it:—but to yield us sufficient reason, both to persuade us of the truth of His message (as by the rest of His works, so especially by rising again from the dead), and also to induce us to embrace the Gospel, by assuring us of the fulfilling of that promise to us, which we see so eminently performed in Him by that height to which we believe Him to be exalted; and

The opinion of Socinus concerning the whole covenant of grace.

<sup>k</sup> Art. xiii. Of Works before Justification.

<sup>l</sup> e.g. *Op. Imperf. cont. Julian.*, lib.

ii. cap. 146; *Op. S. Aug.*, tom. x. p. 1010. C.



BOOK  
II.

then, having induced us to undertake the Gospel of Christ, to secure us both of protection against the enemies thereof here, by that power which He that went before us in it hath obtained for that purpose, and of our crown at the judgment to come. And all this, not in any consideration of the merits and sufferings of Christ, but of God's free grace, which alone moved Him to deal with us by Christ to this effect, and to propose a reward so unproportionable to our performance; which would not redound to the account of His free grace, if it should be thought to have been purchased, either by the satisfaction of Christ, in regard of our sins to be redeemed, or by His merits, in regard of the reward to be purchased<sup>m</sup>.

[And concerning justification by faith.]

§ 6. As for the matter of justification by faith alone, it is to be observed, that Socinus is obliged by the premises to understand that grace, for which the Gospel is called "The Covenant of Grace," to be no grace of Christ<sup>n</sup>; that is to say,

<sup>m</sup> "Deus pro summa et sola Sua bonitate olim decrevit omnibus respicientibus, et in posterum sobrie," &c. "viventibus, omnia peccata condonare, eosque post hanc mortalem vitam ad immortalem . . . transferre. . . Propterea Jesum Christum . . . in mundum misit, nimirum ut hanc Ipsius voluntatem mundo patefaceret. Hinc factum est, ut Christus Jesus non modo tantam Dei bonitatem nobis annuntiaverit, ac mirandis infinitis operibus confirmaverit, verum etiam ejus annuntiandæ occasione mortem crucis, Ipso Deo mandante, subierit. . . Neque hoc ad Suam nobis voluntatem patefaciendum satis Deo visum fuit, sed præterea voluit, ut in Ipsius Jesu persona rem prorsus sic se habere, quemadmodum Is nobis Patris Sui nomine exposuerat, videremus. Atque hanc ob causam, Eum, Quem nobis nostræ vitæ Exemplar proposuerat, tertio postquam interfectus fuerat die a mortuis excitavit, ac postmodum in cælum ad immortalem vitam transtulit. Verum neque hoc etiam contentus, ne ullus penitus dubitationi locus relinqueretur, Ipsi Jesu tantam in cælo et in terra, tanquam obedientiæ scilicet usque ad mortem crucis insigne præmium, potestatem dedit, ut eos, qui viam ab Ipso cum verbis tum Sui Ipsius exemplo præmonstratam ingressi et persecuti fuerint, in mediis etiam calamitatibus et ipsa morte perpetuo fovere, et confirmare, ac tandem æterna

vita donare Ipse posset. Itaque nemo est, qui hæc omnia facta fuisse aut animadverterit aut crediderit, qui de prædicta Divina voluntate amplius dubitare potuerit. . . Igitur . . . merito scriptum est, Christum mortuum fuisse pro peccatis nostris, . . . et alia ejusmodi; non quia Is Deo morte Sua id solverit, quod nos propter scelera nostra Ejus justitiæ debebamus, . . . aut quia merito tam insignis obedientiæ Sux iram Dei adversus nos placaverit; siquidem neque his rebus quidquam opus erat, neque eæ ullo modo fieri poterant: sed quia nos, qui a Deo adversi eramus, Sui sanguinis fusione ac morte interveniente, ad Deum, Qui jam ultro pacem nobis offerebat, et in Ipso Christo quam maxime propitium nobis Se ea ratione ostendebat, adduxit, atque ut Illi in posterum confideremus, exque Illius præscripto obediremus, effecit." Socin., Justificationis Nostræ per Christum Synopsis, Op., tom. ii. p. 247. a. See also his De Christo Salvatore, P. i. cap. 1., *ibid.*, p. 121. a; and cap. 2; *ibid.*, p. 124, b; and *passim*.

<sup>n</sup> Socinus avoids the expression "Gratia Christi:" and the summary of his doctrine on the subject is this,—"Statuendum omnino esse, Jesum Christum ideo servatorem nostrum esse, quia salutis æternæ viam nobis annuntiaverit, confirmaverit, et in Sua Ipsius persona cum vitæ exemplo tum ex mortuis resurgendo manifeste osten-

not given out of any consideration of His merits and sufferings : which they neither acknowledge to have been tendered CHAP. I. by our Lord, nor accepted by the Father, to any such effect or purpose. But nothing hinders him therefore to acknowledge it the grace of God<sup>o</sup>; that is, a mere grant of His free goodness, whatsoever condition He require thereby to qualify him that embraces it for the promises which it tenders, provided it be such as he that it is tendered to can accomplish. For that faith which alone justifieth according to St. Paul, [Rom. iii. 28.] he maketh to consist in believing the truth of Christianity, and sincerely endeavouring to bring forth the fruits thereof, out of a grounded confidence of obtaining the said promises; and that, in consideration hereof, those that thus believe are counted righteous before God; that is, treated as if they had been originally righteous, and not sinners before they came to believe<sup>p</sup>.

§ 7. As for the Sacrament of Baptism, making no more [And concerning Baptism.] of a Church than of an arbitrary society of so many as agree to serve God together in the same faith<sup>q</sup>, it is no marvel if he make it a mere ceremony; the use whereof was, during the time of the disciples of our Lord, and the conversion

derit, vitamque æternam nobis Ei fidem habentibus Ipse daturus sit." De Christo Servatore, P.<sup>3</sup>.i. cap. 8., Op., tom. ii. p. 142. b.

\* "Fides igitur est Dei donum, eo quod Deus iis, quibus per Evangelii patefactionem fidem offert, nihil prorsus debet; non autem quia eam alia ratione in hominum corda infundat." Socin., De Fide et Operibus, Op., tom. ii. p. 250. b.

"Fides (nempe in Christum) Dei donum est, quia nemo, cui facultas in Christum credendi datur (datur autem generatim omnibus, quibus annunciat Christus), ut ea facultas sibi datur, commertus antea fuerat; non autem quia, quicumque in Christum credit, id ex singulari Spiritus Sancti dono habuerit, quo caruerint illi qui non credunt." Id., De Christo Servatore, P. iv. cap. 12; ib., p. 240. a.

† "Fides in Christum, quæ nos justos coram Deo constituit, . . . nihil aliud est, . . . quam Christo confidere; id est, non solum quæcunque Christus ad nos spectantia dixit, vera esse credere; sed etiam ea tanti æstimare, ut, si quid nos facere præcepit, id faciamus; si

quid nos sperare jussit, id speramus; vel, ut significantius atque apertius dicam, si quid boni nos, si aliqua fecerimus, consecuturos esse affirmavit, non modo id verum esse, nobis persuadere, sed, ut bonum illud consequi possimus, ea facere non dubitare." Socin., De Christo Servatore, P. iv. cap. 11; Op., tom. ii. p. 234. b.

"Jam vero cur hac in Christum fide, quam exposuimus, justificemur, causæ in promptu est. . . . Fragilitatis humanæ misertus Deus clementissimus, quamvis omnia Ejus præcepta perpetuo exactissime non conservemus, . . . pro perfecte justis nihilominus tamen nos habere voluit, dummodo Ipsi confidamus, id est, Ei ex animo obedientes, omnem spem nostram in Ipso collocemus." Id., ibid., p. 235. b.

"Fides in Christum qua justificamur, . . . propter Dei clementiam (justificat), Qui ejusmodi opus facientibus, . . . justitiam, quantumvis antea injustis, imputare dignatus est, et ipsos pro justis coram Se habere pro incomparabili Sua bonitate voluit." Id., ibid., p. 239. a.

‡ See above, § 2. note e.



BOOK II. of Jews and Gentiles to Christianity by their preaching, to signify the purifying of them by that faith, to which they professed thereby to be converted; which intent ceasing in those, who being born of Christian parents were never tainted with the filthiness either of Jews or Gentiles, by consequence, that ceremony, though it may freely be used by Christians, in the nature of a thing indifferent, yet ought not to carry that opinion as if any man's salvation depended upon it<sup>r</sup>.

\* "De aquæ baptismo ego ita sentio, eum Ecclesiæ in perpetuum præscriptum non fuisse, nec unquam, ut illum acciperent, iis præceptum neque a Christo neque ab Apostolis fuisse, qui jam Ipsi Christo alia quacunque ratione publice nomen dedissent, vel a primis annis in Christiana disciplina educati atque instituti essent." Socin., De Ecclesia, § de Baptismo, tom. i. p. 351.—"Dico, aquæ baptismum ad Ecclesiam externam hoc tempore instaurandam, meo iudicio, nihil pertinere, remque indifferentem esse (in qua utinam fratres nostri nihil novare tentassent) . . . Crediderim tamen, si is hodieque retinendus sit, propter eos qui ab aliis religionibus ad Christi religionem convertuntur, potissime retinendum esse." Id., *ibid.*—"Omnia Evangelistarum et Apostolorum scripta diligentissime perquirens, nusquam nec apertis verbis baptismum aquæ externum omnibus in perpetuum, qui Christiani esse velint, peræque præceptum esse invenio, nec aliquid dictum ex quo eam sententiam elici omnino debere aut posse appareat. Quod ut Ecclesia dijudicare possit, statui eos omnes locos primum accurate expendere, in quibus præcepti illius vel species quidem aliqua aut vestigium extare videtur," &c. Id., in Disputat. an homini Christiano aquæ baptismo carere liceat, in Præfat., tom. i. pp. 709, 710.—"Quid igitur, dixerit fortasse quispiam, num tu alter Novatus esse vis, et aquæ baptismum abrogare? Minime gentium. Imo nunquam eos laudare potui, qui sive nostris sive patrum memoria hac in re aliquid novare tentarunt. Quoniam igitur passim receptum est, ut qui Ecclesiæ annumerari debeant, aquæ baptismo sint tincti, tingantur porro aquæ baptismo omnes, qui pro jam tinctis non habentur. Nihil enim prohibet, quominus id fieri possit, quamvis ut fiat, præceptum non fuerit. Quemadmodum nihil prohibet, quominus, ex-

empli causa, ab esu carniarum, ubi id receptum fuerit, abstinere possimus, quamvis, ut abstineamus, nullum præceptum habeamus." Id., *ibid.*, cap. xvii.; *ibid.*, p. 736.—"Quod si quis a nobis quærat, ut, quid Ecclesiæ bene ceteroquin constitutæ, in hoc baptismi negotio hoc tempore faciendum esse judicemus, enucleatius exponamus. Dico primum, censere me, ut quicumque ex Judæis, vel Turcis, vel aliis qui Jesu Christi religionem minime profitentur, ad ipsum Christum convertuntur, in Ipsius Jesu Christi nomen omnino aqua baptizentur, ipsique ea ratione initiuntur. Etsi enim ea de re nullum expressum et perpetuum mandatum extat, Apostolos tamen, qui id facere consueverunt, imitari decet: præsertim cum ab universa Ecclesia eum morem receptum ac perpetuo usu comprobatum fuisse aut constet aut certe admodum credibile videatur. . . . Jam de eorum baptismo, qui ex parentibus pro fratribus agnitis et receptis nascuntur, ita statuo, ut, quando jam diu de infantium baptismo quæstio agitata est, nec vel si infantes baptizentur, id per se ipsum quicquam mali parere posse videtur, potestas unicuique fiat suos infantes vel baptizandi vel secus." Id., *ibid.*, pp. 736, 737.—"Fingo enim sic rem se habere ut nos affirmamus, aquæ videlicet baptismum pro iis tantum fuisse, qui ab alia quapiam sive etiam nulla religione ad Jesu Christi religionem converterentur," &c. . . . "Ut enim sæpius dictum fuit, ingens discrimen est in aquæ baptismi negotio inter primitivam illam ex gentibus et Judæis ad Christi nomen conversis constantem Ecclesiam, et eas, quæ deinceps usque ad hæc tempora ex iis, qui ab ipsis incunabulis Christo nomen publice dederunt, coagmentatæ fuere." Id., *ibid.*, cap. xiv.; *ibid.*, pp. 731, 733. And so also cap. ii. p. 711. See also Book i. Of the Principles of Christian Truth, chap. vii. § 24, note m.

4 § 8. And having related this opinion, I must relate another CHAP. I.  
opposite to this in another extreme: which is the opinion of those who make justifying faith the knowledge of a man's predestination, opposite to it in another extreme: those that hold that faith which alone justifieth, to consist in believing that a man is predestinated by God to life from everlasting, as being of the number of them whom Christ was sent to redeem, exclusively to the rest of mankind; and that therefore the whole consideration for which this faith justifieth, is the obedience of Christ, imputed unto them which are of this number, upon no other account than the eternal purpose of God to give Him for them alone; whereby His sufferings are theirs in law, as much as if they had been performed by themselves; the condition of faith serving only to limit a qualification, without which this purpose availeth them not, being limited to take place from the time that this purpose of God is revealed unto them, the revelation whereof they suppose to be that faith which alone justifieth<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> Thorndike appears to have had the Scotch Presbyterians, and in particular Rutherford, in his thoughts in this passage. See below in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vi. § 4. and the notes there. Parts however of the scheme of doctrine sketched by him were held both in the French Reformed Church, to which Covet, Socinus' opponent, belonged, and among the English Presbyterians of his time.

"That God giveth faith in His time unto some, and not unto others, this proceeds from His everlasting decree;... and in the execution of this decree, He doth by His grace soften the hearts of the elect though they be never so hard and stony, and maketh them to believe, but He doth in His righteous judgment leave the non-elect to their wickedness and obduracy." Canons of Synod of Charenton in 1623, chap. i. canon vi. in Quicke's Synod. Gall. Reform., vol. ii. p. 127.—"Now election is the unchangeable purpose of God, by which according to the most free and good pleasure of His will, out of mere grace, He hath chosen in Jesus Christ unto salvation before the foundation of the world out of mankind, fallen by their own fault from their first integrity into sin and destruction, a certain number of men, who were in themselves not better than others." Ibid., can. vii. Ibid.—"This self-same election was not done out of foreseen faith, and obedience of faith, holiness, or any

other good quality and disposition, as a cause or condition pre-required in man that is to be elected, but that God might give him faith and obedience of faith and true holiness." Ibid., can. ix.; *ibid.*, p. 128.—"God's decree of election can never be broken off, nor changed, nor revoked, nor disannulled, nor can the elect be reprobated, nor their number impaired and diminished." Ibid., can. xi. *ibid.*—"The elect are in due time assured of their everlasting and unchangeable election unto salvation, though it be done gradually and in a very unequal measure. Nor do they get it by a curious diving into the depths and secrets of God, but upon an exact scrutiny into their own hearts they meet with spiritual joys and holy heavenly rejoicings, and with those infallible fruits of their election noted and recorded in the Word of God, such as faith unfeigned in the Lord Jesus, a filial fear of God, godly sorrow for sin, and hungering and thirsting after righteousness." Ibid., can. xii. *ibid.*

"We believe, that our whole righteousness is founded in the remission of sins, which is (as David calleth it) our only happiness. Wherefore we do utterly reject all other means by which men do think they may be justified before God, and casting away all conceits of our own virtues and merits, we do altogether rest upon the sole obedience of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to us, as well for the covering of

BOOK § 9. Who they are that maintain this opinion, I will not  
 IL here dispute; which I intend to shew cause why it is to be

our offences as that we may find grace and favour with God." Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in France, received and enacted in 1559, article xviii.; in Quicke, *ibid.*, introduction, p. x.

"Fourthly, Christ is the end of perfection of the Law, in that His righteousness and obedience unto the Law is made ours, and so in Him as our surety we fulfill the Law. I know this assertion hath many learned and godly adversaries, but as farre as I can see yet, the Scripture seemeth to hold it forth. . . . I see not why we need grant this consequence, 'Because Christ's fulfilling of the Law is made ours, therefore we have eternall life by the Law.' And the reason is, because this righteousness of Christ's is not ours by working but by believing. Now the Law, in that command, 'Doe this and live,' did require our personall working and righteousness; so that we cannot be said to have salvation by that rule, because it is not the righteousness which we in person have wrought: and this will fully appeare, if you consider in the next place, the subject to whom Christ is made righteousness, and that is 'to him that beleeveth:' he doth not say, to him that worketh, so that we have not eternall life by our 'Doe this,' but by 'beleveth,' or resting upon Christ His 'Doe this.'" Burgess, *Vindiciæ Legis* (see below, § 10. note z), p. 261.—But, on the other hand, "Christ's obedience exempts not from ours." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 13: and, *The Antinomians* "tell us not only of a righteousness or justification by imputation, but also saintship and holiness by the obedience of Christ, and hence it is God seeth no sin in believers: this is a dangerous position." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 38.—Burgess was a leading Presbyterian member of the Westminster Assembly.

"For a close of all, that which in this cause we affirm may be summed up in this: Christ did not dye for any upon condition if they doe believe, but He died for all God's elect, that they should believe, and believing have eternall life; faith itselfe is among the principall effects and fruits of the death of Christ, as shall be declared: it is no where said in Scripture, nor can it reasonably be affirmed, that if we believe, Christ dyed for us, as though our

believing should make that to be which otherwise was not, the act create the object, but Christ dyed for us, that we might believe; salvation indeed is bestowed conditionally, but faith which is the condition is absolutely procured." *Salus Electorum Sanguis Jesu*, or, the Death of Death in the Death of Christ, a Treatise &c. by John Owen, bk. ii. chap. 5. pp. 111, 112. Lond. 4to. 1648.—Christ "dyed not for believers as believers, though He dyed for all believers, but for all the elect as elect, who by the benefit of His death doe become believers, and so obtaine assurance that He dyed for them: for such of those that are elected, who are not yet believers, though Christ dyed for them, yet we deny that they can have any assurance of it, whilst they continue such." *Id.*, *ibid.*, bk. iv. chap. 7. p. 319.—John Owen was a rigid Calvinist in doctrine, and became an Independent in 1643 (*Neal*, *Hist. of Purit.*, vol. ii. pp. 738, 739.). The treatise of his here quoted is especially directed against "universal redemption."

"God having, out of His mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the state of sin and misery, and to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer." Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, Ans. to Qu. 20.

Compare also the statement condemned by Baxter in his *Aphorisms of Justification* (Lond. 12mo. 1629.) pp. 44—46.—"Whether we are justified onely by Christ's passive righteousness, or also by His active, is a very great dispute among divines. By His passive righteousness is meant not onely His death but the whole of His humiliation from the assumption of the humane nature to His resurrection; yea, even His obedienciall actions so far as there was any suffering in them, and as they are considered under the notion of suffering and not of duty or obedience. By His active righteousness is meant the righteousness of His actions, as they were a perfect obedience to the Law. The chiefe point of difference and difficulty lyeth higher, How the righteousness of Christ is made ours? Most of our ordinary divines say, that Christ did as properly obey in our



thought so ill of, that I could wish that no man that is called a Christian would own it. And perhaps many of those, who either expressly or in effect do hold it, do withal hold other points, which indeed and in effect are contradictions to it. Neither can I say that our Presbyterians are parties in it<sup>1</sup>. But this I say, that this is the opinion, in opposition to which Socinus brought in the opinion hitherto described, voiding the grace and satisfaction of Christ, by declining to the other extreme; as any man may see, that with a little care shall peruse the fourth part of his book *De Christo Salvatore*, cap. iii. ix. x.<sup>2</sup> And therefore I conceive I may justly infer, that to maintain this extremity (which he, not consulting the Catholic Church and the faith thereof, thought necessary to the voiding of that other extreme, which he found inconsistent with the principles of Christianity), he proceeded so far as to deny any Godhead, any being, of Christ, before His birth of the Virgin<sup>3</sup>; taking away, by con-

room or stead, as He did suffer in our stead: and that in God's esteem and in point of law wee were in Christ's obeying and suffering, and so in Him wee did both perfectly fulfill the commands of the Law by obedience, and the threatenings of it by bearing the penalty; and thus (say they) is Christ's righteousness imputed to us, viz. His passive righteousness for the pardon of our sins and delivering us from the penalty, His active righteousness for the making of us righteous, and giving us title to the kingdom: and some say, the habituall righteousness of His humane nature instead of our own habituall righteousness; yea, some adde the righteousness of the Divine nature also. This opinion (in my judgment) containeth a great many of mistakes."

<sup>1</sup> See quotations in note s.

<sup>2</sup> "Asseris igitur" (writes Socinus to his opponent), "Christi satisfactionem nobis per fidem imputari... quod nihil aliud est, quam ex eo, quod credimus Jesum Christum pro peccatis nostris morte Sua Divinae justitiae plenissime satisfecisse, id consequi, ut nos istius satisfactionis participes fiamus." *De Christo Salvatore*, P. iv. cap. 3: Op., tom. ii. p. 216. b.—"Pugnantia omnino loquitur enunciatum tuum. Dum enim dicit, credendum esse, Christum pro peccatis nostris satis-

fecisse: jam, antequam credamus, reipsa pro nobis satisfactum fuisse, aperte affirmat. Dum vero dicit, per istam fidem nobis satisfactionem illam tribui; satisfactum reipsa pro nobis fuisse, antequam credamus, non minus aperte negat. Sed finge, non pugnare hæc inter se, quid alioqui absurdius excogitari potest, quam alicui beneficium dari, si credat sibi beneficium datum esse." Ib., p. 217. a.—"Quod postremo istius vestra in Christum fidei commentum plane reteggit, illud est, quod (ut vos ipsi non negatis) ea fides in Christum, qua justificamur, sine bonis operibus esse non potest; ista autem vestra in Christum fides nihil cum bonis operibus commune habet." Ib., cap. 9; ib., p. 232. a.—"Fides Dei donum est... non quia, quicumque in Christum credit, id ex singulari Spiritus Sancti dono habuerit, quo caruerint illi qui non credunt: adeo ut, quemadmodum in potestate eorum, qui non credunt, positum non fuerit ut crederent, sic in potestate eorum, qui credunt, positum non fuerit ut non crederent. Sic enim tu sine dubio... fidem in Christum Dei donum esse interpretaris." Ib., cap. 12; ib., p. 240. a.

<sup>3</sup> In his disputation with Erasmus Johannis (Op., tom. ii. pp. 493, sq.), the position denied by Socinus is, "Christum fuisse unigenitum Dei Filium antequam ex Virgine nasceretur;"

BOOK  
II.

sequence, that reason and ground both of satisfaction for sin, and of merit of grace, which the Church ascribeth to His obedience and sufferings; and placing the Godhead of Christ (which he acknowledgeth so far as to tender Him the worship that is proper to God, at least in some circumstances\*) in that height of eminence to which God hath exalted Him for undertaking and performing the commission of reconciling man to God, though bound to it as a mere man, and God's creature, before he undertook it<sup>†</sup>. And thus you see, how that part of Socinus his heresy, in denying the faith of the Holy Trinity, indirectly cometh into the question of the 'Covenant of Grace;' seeing it is manifest to the sense of all men, that had he not

but he shrinks from speaking of our Lord as "purus homo." *Ib.*, *Argum.* i. p. 494. a.—In his answer ad *Parænesim Andr. Volan.*, *ib.*, p. 379. a, he says to his opponent, "At dices, nos negare Eum extitisse antequam ex Maria Virgine nasceretur: recte est." And see below, note y.

\* Socinus sustains the affirmative (but with qualifications) in a disputation with *Franciscus Davidis*, *De non Invocando Jesu Christo in precibus Sacris* (*Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 713, sq.), and with *Christian Franken*, *Utrum Christus, cum Ipse perfectissima ratione Deus non sit, religiosa tamen adoratione colendus sit necne*. See also his answer to the second letter of *Joh. Niemojevius* (*Op.*, tom. i. pp. 412, sq.), his letter to *G. Eniedinus* (*ib.*, pp. 483, sq.), and his *Christ. Religionis Institutio* (*ib.*, pp. 669—674.)—"Quod igitur attinet ad *Johannis* loca . . . dico . . . me agnoscere, idque perlibenter, inde aperte colligi, Christo una cum Deo Patre adorationem convenire, et quidem ejusdem generis, id est, cultum Divinum: interim tamen nego totam illam adorationem quæ soli æterno Deo debetur, Filio quoque Illius competere Domino Jesu Christo." *Responsio ad Respons. Andr. Volan.*, *ib.*, p. 410. b; and see also *ibid.*, p. 385.

† "Etsi Christum antequam ex Maria nasceretur revera non extitisse sentio, Illum tamen Deum esse ipse confiteor; Eumque verum, id est, non falsum aut imaginarium: et licet Christum illum Deum esse negem, Qui cælum terramque condidit," &c. *Respons. ad Respons. Andr. Volan.*, ad *partic.* 59: *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 421. a.—"Jesum Naza-

rænum, id est, Hominem illum Qui, imperante Tiberio Cæsare, Hierosolymis crucifixus fuit, et a mortuis resurrexit, Qui solus Dei Ille Filius est nec alius præter aut ante Ipsum, Hunc, inquam, una cum Thoma Ejus Apostolo Dominum et Deum nostrum esse confitemur." *Ib.*, ad *part.* 53; *ib.*, p. 412. b.—"Aliud est ipsum nomen Deus; aliud Is, Qui potissimum hoc nomine appellatur. Aliud item Dei nomen propria sua significatione" (scil. as equivalent to Dominator, Judex, Gubernator, &c.) "acceptum, quam adhuc retinet; aliud ea acceptum qua usurpari consuevit" (scil. as the name of God the Father). *Ib.*, ad *part.* 48; *ib.*, p. 407. a.—"Satis nobis est, si, quod ad hanc rem attinet, confiteatur unusquisque, Deum Illum Summum Jehovah esse unum, nempe Eum Qui Pater est Domini nostri Jesu Christi, nec alium esse præter Illum: Jesum autem Nazarenum, Hominem scilicet illum Qui vere crucifixus fuit, esse Dei viventis Filium, Cui omnia tradita sint a Deo in manus, Quemque nos colere, et ab Ipso vitam æternam expectare oporteat: quidquid de Ipso Filio Dei alioqui sentiat, antequam ex Maria nasceretur." *Ad Paræn. Andr. Volan.*, *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 382. b.—"Illud urgeo, tum demum tantam potestatem Christum habuisse, cum per omnia Patri obediens inventus est." *Respons. ad Respons. Andr. Volan.*, ad *part.* i.; *ibid.*, p. 384. a.—"Atqui Christus, licet res creata, non opinione tantum sed re ipsa est Deus; et quidem Deus Noster, nobis revera ab Uno Illo Deo datus et constitutus." *Ib.*, ad *part.* 49; *ib.*, p. 408. b.



questioned the Godhead of Christ, there had been no pre- CHAP. I.  
tence of bringing the faith of the Trinity into any dispute.

§ 10. But of what consequence this opinion concerning The differ-  
justifying faith and the nature of it is to the substance of I.  
Christianity, it will be time to consider, when I have shewed tence be-  
why it is not true. In the mean, I shall note here another tween it  
opinion, differing in somewhat, but agreeing in much, with and that of  
this: which I take to be the opinion of our Antinomians.  
but shall not be much troubled if any man shall dispute that  
I mistake it. For seeing them so full with a blasphemous  
conceit of God's Spirit, that they would think it a disparage-  
ment to it to be tied to any dispute of reason (though upon  
supposition of the Christian faith), to distinguish between  
principles and conclusions, to infer a certain position from  
certain grounds, even of Scripture; I cannot think it any  
great imputation to misunderstand them, whose perfection it  
is not to understand themselves. For when I name Anti-  
nomians, I intend to comprise in the opinion which I refute  
all our Anabaptists, all our Familists, all our Enthusiasts,  
and Quakers; all sectaries whatsoever, that do believe them-  
selves possessed of the Spirit, not presupposing (not only the  
belief of that faith which is necessary to the salvation of all  
Christians, but also) whatsoever else it shall appear that the  
condition of the covenant of grace importeth; the having  
of God's Spirit, as it inferreth a right to everlasting life, so  
supposing whatsoever the covenant of grace importeth.

§ 11. But by the noise which they make with "the free  
Grace of God," and "the Covenant of Grace," I conceive

\* The Westminster Assembly "ap-  
pointed a committee to peruse the  
writings of" Dr. Tobias Crisp, Mr.  
John Saltmarsh, Mr. John Eaton,  
"and others," on the charge of Anti-  
nomianism: "who having drawn out  
some of their most dangerous positions,  
reported them to the Assembly, when  
they were not only condemned but con-  
futed," &c. Neal's Hist. of the Puri-  
tans, vol. ii. p. 48. Lond. 1754. See  
also *ibid.*, pp. 12, 327: and the Athen.  
Oxon. under the names Tob. Crisp,  
John Ley, John Eaton. See also Ed-  
wards' *Gangræna*, part i. pp. 25, 26,  
for a list of their tenets; *Vindiciæ*  
*Legis*, or a Vindication of the Moral  
Law . . . from Papists, Socinians, Ar-

minians, and more especially Antino-  
mians, by Anthony Burgess, pp. 13.  
38. 134. 266—271. Lond. 4to. 1646;  
and Gataker's *Shadowes without Sub-  
stance*, or *Pretended New Lights*, by  
way of rejoinder to Mr. John Salt-  
marsh, Lond. 4to. 1646; and an ac-  
count of their revival by Dr. Crisp's  
son and others in 1690, in Nelson's  
*Life of Bishop Bull*, pp. 222—236.  
Oxf. 1827.

\* One of Saltmarsh's publications,  
entitled *Free Grace*, or the *Flowing*  
of Christ's Blood freely to Sinners,  
(Lond. 4to. 1645,) and which speaks  
of himself and his party as "the as-  
sertors of free grace," is answered by  
G . . . nianism Dis-

BOOK  
II.

the main of their position lies in one step beyond that extreme, which I described even now, in opposition to Socinus;—that we are justified by the obedience of Christ, performed for them for whom God appointed it, and therefore imputed to them from everlasting by virtue of that appointment made from everlasting, but revealed to them by that faith, whereby they know themselves to be elected to life from everlasting; not depending upon the revelation thereof, but the revelation upon the being of it. And upon this ground it is that they say, that “God sees not, nor can see sin in His elect<sup>b</sup>”; that “all their sins are pardoned before they are done<sup>c</sup>”; and that “there is no mortal sin but repentance, implying the want of saving faith, with which no sin can stand, nor any thing be but sin without it<sup>d</sup>”; and the like blasphemies innumerable.

covered and Confuted, Lond. 4to. 1652. And the phrase was the common text-word of the sect.

<sup>b</sup> “God Himself testifieth, that He doth see no sin in His justified children.” John Eaton, Honeycomb of Free Justification by Christ Alone, c. 3. p. 35. Lond. 4to. 1642: and see the Preface to God’s Eye on His Israel, or a Passage of Balaam, . . expounded and cleared from Antinomian abuse, by Thomas Gataker, B.D. Lond. 4to. 1645; which is mainly an answer to Eaton, and charges him with maintaining, that, “as God doth not, so He will not, see sin in His justified children, . . and yet further, that He cannot.”

“No sin can make one less beloved of God.” Free Grace, &c., by John Saltmarsh, p. 79, as quoted in Gataker’s Antinomianism Confuted, &c., p. 18. Lond. 4to. 1652.

<sup>c</sup> “Another wild position which these sermons maintain, is this, that ‘all is done from eternity, and so nothing is to be done now;’ and again, ‘that God’s pardoning sinners and justifying the ungodly are not now or hereafter to be done; they are not present or future, but were dispatched long ago, even from eternity.’” Crispianism Unmasked, or A Discovery of the several Erroneous Assertions and Pernicious Doctrines maintained in Dr. Crisp’s Sermons, occasioned by the reprinting of those Discourses, pp. 50, 51. Lond. 4to. 1693: from the Sermons of Tobias Crisp, D.D., vol. ii. Sermon 8, “the title of which sermon is, Our Sins

are already laid on Christ.” Dr. Crisp’s Sermons were first published at London in 1643, the year after his death.

<sup>d</sup> “That a child of God need not, nay ought not, to ask pardon for sin: and that it is no less than blasphemy for him so to do.”—alleged (in the Pref. to Gataker’s God’s Eye on His Israel) to have been “delivered” by a Mr. Randall “in private and defended in publike.”—“For ‘a believer’ as one of them” (in margin “Mr. Randall”) “sought to salve it, ‘to aske forgiveness of his sin, as if Christ had not made full satisfaction to God for it,’ was a point of much ‘impiety.’” Pref. to Gataker’s God’s Eye on His Israel.—“Let believers sinne as fast as they will, there is a fountain open for them to wash in.”—“averted to have been delivered by one of them” (marg. “Mr. Simson”) “in the pulpit.” Ibid.—“Doth any man declare unto you repentance as a means to obtain remission and forgiveness at the hands of the Father? These are the footsteps of the man of sin, of the son of perdition.” The Man of Sin discovered, a sermon by Henry Denne, p. 26. 4to. Lond. 1645. See also Gataker’s Shadows without Substance, pp. 36, 37; Edwards’ Gangræna, part ii. pp. 144, 146; and Dr. Rutherford’s Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist, opening the secrets of Familisme and Antinomianisme in the Antichristian doctrines of John Saltmarsh and Will. Del, &c., 4to. Lond. 1648.



§ 12. I know there are other opinions of justification by faith alone among those that profess it, according to the senses which they may have of the nature of justifying faith, and those perhaps of greater vogue than this which I have named. Neither is it my intent to involve those that maintain justification by faith alone in the blame which I charge the opinions hitherto described with. The reason why I mention these opinions here is, because they are in the extremes; and therefore the mention of them seemed to propose the state of that question which I pretend to resolve. For my way shall be, in the first place, to answer the question proposed, concerning that disposition which the covenant of grace requireth the mind of him to be formally affected with, that will be qualified for the promises which God thereby tendereth: making this account, that the treating of it will give us an overture into the consideration, both of the effective cause, that produceth it in those that have it, and also of the meritorious cause, that moveth God both originally to grant the said effective cause, and consequently to accept the effect thereof for a competent qualification of them that have it, for the promises which God by His Gospel tendereth those that receive it.

CHAP.  
I.  
That there  
are mean  
opinions.

## CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE WHAT IS THE CONDITION OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE. THE CONTRACT OF BAPTISM. THE PROMISE OF THE HOLY GHOST ANNEXED TO CHRIST'S, NOT TO JOHN'S BAPTISM. THOSE ARE MADE CHRIST'S DISCIPLES AS CHRISTIANS THAT TAKE UP HIS CROSS IN BAPTISM. THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM ACCORDING TO THE APOSTLES.

To proceed to as brief and as clear a resolution of this point as I can propose, I say, that a sincere and resolute profession to undertake Christianity, and to live according to it (believing as our Lord Christ hath revealed, and living as He hath taught), consigned to God in the hands of His Church by the Sacrament of Baptism, is that condition, which the covenant of grace requireth to qualify us for the promises which it tendereth. This resolution is directly against the Antinomians, and those that

[What is  
the con-  
dition of  
the cove-  
nant of  
grace.]



BOOK  
II.

Christian is justified by the obedience of Christ imputed from everlasting to them whom He came to save; which indeed nullifieth the covenant of grace, and converteth it to a mere promise on God's part, requiring no condition on man's part to be performed by him, to qualify him for it. But this resolution opposing that conceit so roundly, as positively to express the condition which I intend to maintain; it will serve, both against the conceit of Socinus,—that justifying faith is nothing but a firm belief, that those who believed the Gospel, purposing to live as God requireth, are accepted by Him as righteous, baptism into the profession of Christianity not included<sup>e</sup>;—but also of those that will have it to consist in the knowledge of our being predestinate to life from everlasting, revealed by God's word, and sealed by His Spirit.

6

Evidence  
what is the  
condition  
of the  
covenant  
of grace.

- § 2. The proofs of it I will divide into three heads: for, consisting of so many branches as you see, it cannot be expected that those Scriptures which shall serve to evidence it, should every where express all the parts of it. It is enough if the several parts of it, out of which the whole results, be
1. demonstrable by several ranks of Scriptures. The first, of those Scriptures that concern the profession, which God, by our Lord Christ, requireth (and He by His Apostles, and the Church after them to the world's end) of them that will be qualified for the promises which the Gospel tendereth: which I put in the first place, expressly because they seem to contain the most visible and express arguments that the principles and practice of Christianity can yield to en-
  2. force this truth. The second shall be taken from the nature of faith, and the attributes ascribed to it by the Scriptures, in justifying, saving, regenerating, or adopting us for sons, giving us the spirit of God's sons, remitting our sins, and the rest that we expect at God's hands by virtue of His
  3. covenant of grace. The last shall be from those passages, of the Apostles chiefly, and consequently of other Scriptures that they expound, wherein it is denied, that we are saved or justified by works or by the law; but affirmed, that we are saved and justified by grace and by faith: the due sense and intent whereof is the thread to guide us through the intric-

<sup>e</sup> See above, § 6, note p.

cies of this whole dispute. Though, when this is done, I shall not wish any man to resolve himself in this, or in any other point of the whole book, till he hath gone through the whole; and considered what resolution this general infers to all other branches or dependances of it: and therefore shall think he does nothing, that goes about to disprove any part of it, without shewing the resolution, which his opinion infers, to those other points or dependances; that the reader may have the choice before him, which he thinks most consequent, in reason, to the principles of Christianity received on all sides.

§ 3. I will begin with the words of the Apostle, 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21; where this seems to be couched *in terminis*. He saith, that "the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noe, while the ark was making, in which a few, that is, eight souls, were saved; the antitype whereof, baptism, now saveth us (not the laying down of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." The water of "baptism saveth us" through the temptations of the world, as they were saved through the deluge. And what can be done more than to "save" us? Let no man think to defeat this by striving about words,—that to save, and to justify, is not the same<sup>f</sup>. If baptism import the condition of the covenant of grace which saveth us, our justification will necessarily be wrapt up in the same packet, though to justify and to save be several conceits.

§ 4. And is it not strange, that any man should be persuaded that there is nothing said or meant of the baptism of water in all this passage, but of the baptism of the Spirit, as that which moves a good conscience to profess Christianity<sup>g</sup>? For how can baptism by the Holy Ghost and fire be the

CHAP.  
II.

The contract of baptism.

[Baptism by fire.]

<sup>f</sup> See e. g. Bp. Downham, Treat. of Justification, bk. vi. c. iv. § 2. p. 464: speaking however of good works.

<sup>g</sup> "Apertissime Petrus Apostolus aquæ baptismo vim servandi derogat, spiritualeque baptismo eam tribuit," &c. Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. VI. c. xiv. pp. 668, 669.—"The baptisme of water is John Baptist's ministry till Christ. Christ baptized none nor His disciples, but from John's ministry, so

that baptisme of water is done away, as other legall shaddows: and all baptizing spoken of in the Epistles is spirituall baptizing." Saltmarsh, Sprinkles of Glory, pp. 29, 30: as quoted by Rutherford, Survey of Spirituall Antichrist, Pt. I. c. xviii. p. 200.—See also Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Tr., c. vii. § 24. note n: and below, c. v. § 6; and Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vi.

BOOK  
II.

antitype of the waters of the deluge, as the baptism of water is, and as that baptism which the Apostle speaks of is? The correspondence between the types of the Old, and the antitypes of the New Testament, by virtue of the premises, consists in the correspondence between the temporal deliverance of that time and the spiritual deliverance of this, both in order to the everlasting deliverance of the world to come. Now it is certain, that the visible ceremony of baptism signifies the temptations of this world, out of which we escape by the means of that sacrament; as he that is baptized rises out of the water again. According to that of the Psalm, lxix. 1, 15: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in even unto my soul;" and, "Let not the water-flood drown me, neither let the deep swallow me up; and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." And xlii. 9: "One deep calleth another, because of the noise of thy water-pipes; all thy waves and billows are gone over me." Whereupon St. Paul, Romans vi. 3—5: "Know ye not, that as many as have been baptized into Christ Jesus, have been baptized into His death? we are therefore buried with Him by baptism into death, that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we should also walk in newness of life; for if we have been planted into the like death of His, then shall we be also into the like of His rising again." For when he saith again, Rom. x. 7, "Who shall go down into the deep? to wit, to bring up Christ from the dead;" he sheweth plainly, that by the waters of the deep he understands death. Whereby I suppose it appears sufficiently, that the water of baptism, not the fire of the Holy Ghost, is the antitype to the waters of the deluge. Besides, the baptism of the Holy Ghost is not called baptism but by resemblance of the fire thereof infusing itself into all the soul, as the whole body is drenched in the waters of baptism. Therefore it is not called absolutely baptism, but with an addition abating the property of the sense,—“the baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire.” Therefore, where the term baptism stands without this addition, or any circumstance signifying the same, it cannot be understood.

§ 5. Again, “the interrogating of a good conscience”—“ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα”—signifies, as all men of



learning agree, metonymically, or by synecdoche, the answer, or rather the stipulation, consisting of the interrogatories of baptism, and the answer returned by him that is baptized, undertaking to believe and to live like a Christian. For it is manifest, that it hath been always the custom in the Church of God, as still in the Church of England (which St. Peter here shews that it comes down from the Apostles), to exact of him that is baptized, a solemn vow, promise, or contract, to stand to that which he undertaketh<sup>h</sup>. And this it is which the word ἐπερώτημα here signifies: whereof he that doubts, may see enough in Grotius his Annotations<sup>i</sup> to make him ashamed to doubt any more. When, therefore, St. Peter saith, that "baptism saveth us, not the doing away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God," he does not intend to distinguish the baptism of water from the baptism of the Holy Ghost in opposition to the same; but to distinguish, in the baptism of water, the bodily act of cleansing the flesh from the reasonable act of professing Christianity; which, being done out of "a good conscience towards God," he saith, "saveth us:" and that

CHAP.  
II.

<sup>h</sup> See Vicecomes, *Observ. Eccles.*, tom. i. De Bapt., lib. ii. c. 16. pp. 134—136. 4to. Mediol. 1615;—Cave's *Primit. Christ.*, bk. i. c. 10;—and Bingham, *Antiq. of Chr. Ch.*, XI. vii. 3.

<sup>i</sup> "Ἐπερώτημα [*stipulatio*] est vox juris, ut videre est apud Theophilum titulo Institutionum de Verborum Obligationibus et sequentibus, et apud Græcos Juris Romani interpretes alios. In Glossario, ἐπερωτῶ, *stipulor*. Sed per μετανομίαν [*transnominacionem*], ut in Jure sæpe, nomine *stipulationis* comprehenditur et *responsio* sive *promissio*. Nam et ἐπερωτῶμαι significat *promitto*, *spondeo*, in eodem Glossario. In Baptismo Episcopus aut alius quis ejus nomine ita interrogabat, aut (quod idem est) stipulabatur, Ἀποτάσσει τῷ Σατανῇ; [*Abrenuntiasne Satanae?*] respondebat baptisandus, Ἀποτάσσομαι [*Abrenuntio*]. Rursum interrogatus, Συντάσσει τῷ Χριστῷ; [*Adhaeresne Christo?*] respondebat, Συντάσσομαι [*Adhaereo*]. Hanc *sponsionem salutis* vocat Tertullianus, De Baptismo. Idem de Resurrectione Carnis, *Anima enim non lavatione sed responsione sancitur*. Cyprianus in *interrogationem Baptismi* dixit, Epistola lxxx. et lxxvi. Quare ἐπερώτημα συνεκδραμεως ἀγαθῆς τῷ Θεῷ [*stipulatio con-*

*scientiæ bonæ in Deum*] dicitur hic pro Θεῷ [*Deo*], nempe subaudito ποιηθὲν [*facta*]: *sponsio Deo facta de pura conscientia*." Grot. ad loc.—So also Beza, ad loc.—"Lutherus, in Commentario hujus loci Græcam vocem ἐπερώτημα, quam noster interpretes vertit *interrogationem*, vult significare *pactum*. . . . Eodem fere modo exponit Calvinus, licet vocem ἐπερώτημα non *pactum* sed *responsionem* et *testimonium* significare velit. . . . Est alia expositio Lyrani," &c., . . . "qui per *interrogationem* bonæ conscientiæ intelligunt *interrogationes* et *responsiones* quæ fiunt ante Baptismum." Bellarm., De Sacram. in Genere, lib. i. c. 17; Op., tom. ii. p. 64. A. C.—"Ἐπερώτημα, an interrogative trial of a good conscience towards God." Hooker, E. P., V. lxiii. 3.—See also Bp. Bull, Apol. pro Harm., sect. iv. § 93; Works, vol. iv. pp. 360, 361. Oxf. 1827: and Estius and others ad loc., as quoted by Nicholson, Expos. of Catech., p. 16. Oxf. 1842.—Piscator explains thus: "Unde fit, ut conscientia nostra audacter Deum de hac satisfactione" (nempe Christi) "interroget." Th. i. Loc. xxv. § 19. p.

BOOK II. "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" by virtue whereof

[Rom. vi.  
5.]

St. Paul also saith, that "if we be planted into the like death to Christ's death, we shall also be planted into the like resurrection of Christ's;" supposing that whosoever is baptized takes upon him the profession of Christ's cross, that is, the bearing of it, when his Christianity calls him to it. For when our Lord saith in the Gospel, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" Luke xii. 50; and again, to the sons of Zebedee, Matt. xx. 22, "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism which I shall be baptized with?" He shews sufficiently, that His baptism is His cross. In consideration whereof, that is, of undertaking to bear it out of a good conscience, as Christ was raised from death to life again by the Spirit of holiness, which dwelt in Him without measure; so those that are planted into the likeness of Christ's death in baptism, are promised the grace of God's Spirit to dwell in them, and to raise them from sin here to the life of grace, and from death hereafter to the life of glory in the world to come: as I shewed you in the first Book<sup>k</sup>. So that St. Paul's argument proceeds not upon consideration of the ceremony of baptism, and the natural resemblance it hath with the duty of a Christian, to rise from sin, because he professes to die to it<sup>l</sup> (for that were to think, that the Apostles have but weak arguments to enforce the obligation of Christianity with, when this prime one is made to signify no more than an indecorum, impertinence, or inconsequence, in signifying and professing that by our baptism, which by our lives we perform not): but maketh baptism the protestation of a solemn vow and promise to God, and men, and angels, to live for the future as the profession of Christians importeth. And is it possible to shew man, overtaken in sin, a more valuable consideration to expect salvation upon (and therefore a stronger means to enforce the performance of what he hath undertaken), than his own engagement upon such a consideration as that? We are therefore baptized with Christ unto death, because we have

[Rom. i.  
4.—John  
iii. 34.]

<sup>k</sup> Bk. I. Of the Principles of Christian Truth, c. iii. § 3—6.

<sup>l</sup> "Idcirco ita locutus est Paulus (Rom. vi. 3), ut ostenderet quid professi essent illi qui in Christum Jesum

baptizati fuissent; et ea ratione indignum esse demonstraret ejusmodi homines in peccatis amplius manere." Socin., De Bapt. Aquæ Disp., c. x.; Op., tom. i. p. 728. b.



undertaken, upon our baptism, to mortify ourselves to the world, that we may live to God's service; and, upon that condition, we promise ourselves that we shall be raised from the dead again, though by virtue of Christ's rising again. "Being buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye are also risen with Him, by faith of the effectual working of God, Which raised Him from the dead;" saith St. Paul, Col. ii. 12. For by obliging ourselves to the profession of Christianity from a good heart and clear conscience, we obtain the promise of the Holy Ghost; whereby God effecteth the raising of us to a new life of righteousness, necessarily consequent to the mortifying of sin.

§ 6. Besides these, how many and how excellent effects are attributed to baptism in the writings of the Apostles: which, without St. Peter's distinction, might seem strange, that they should depend upon the cleansing of the flesh; but that they should, by God's appointment, depend upon that engagement, whereby we give ourselves up to Christ for the future, according to his distinction, not at all. For, that this engagement should not be effectual till consigned unto the Church at baptism, cannot seem strange to him that believes the Catholic Church to be, as I have shewed<sup>m</sup>, a corporation founded for the maintenance and exercise of that Christianity, to which we engage ourselves by baptism.

§ 7. When the Jews were pricked in heart to see our Lord, Whom they had crucified, to be risen again, and asked the Apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Acts ii. 37, 38; "Peter saith unto them, 'Repent and be baptized every one of you, . . unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'" Which if it depend upon baptism, what promise of the Gospel is there that does not? To the same purpose, Heb. vi. 4; "It is impossible for them that have once been enlightened, and tasted the heavenly gift, and become partakers of the Holy Ghost:" where you see, that upon "enlightening," that is, baptism<sup>n</sup>, we "become partakers of the Holy Ghost." And this consideration utterly voids the only reason, why our Lord,—when He says to Nicodemus, John iii. 5, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, unless

The promise of the Holy Ghost annexed to Christ's, not to John's, Baptism.

<sup>m</sup> Bk. I. Of the Principles of Christian Truth, cc. vi., vii.

<sup>n</sup> Bingham, Antiq. of Chr. Ch., bk.

XI. c. i. § 4;—Suicer, Thesaurus, sub *ἐκκλησία*.

**BOOK II.**

[Acts ii.  
33, "τὴν  
ἐπαγγελίαν;" x.  
45, "ἣ δω-  
ρεῖται"]

a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"—should not seem to speak of the sacrament of baptism: for at that time, neither was the sacrament of baptism instituted, nor the promise of the Holy Ghost annexed to it°. The Holy Ghost, that is to say, the gift of the Holy Ghost, is no where promised before the Ascension of Christ. For (besides that which I alleged in the beginning<sup>p</sup>, to shew that it presupposeth Christianity), when it is said, John vii. 39, "The Holy Ghost was not yet, because Christ was not yet glorified," the dependance thereof upon the glorifying of our Lord is plainly expressed. And that according to St. Paul, Ephes. iv. 8—12; shewing out of Psal. lxxviii. 18, that the graces of the Holy Ghost, by which the Church is united and compacted into one body, are sent down by God, as a largess, in consideration of the advancement of our Lord to the right hand of God, as in honour of that triumph. Wherewith agreeth St. Peter, Acts ii. 33; 'Being then exalted to (or by) the right hand of God, and having received the gift of the Holy Ghost' (as it is also called, Acts x. 45), "He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Now if any man say, that these visible operations of the Holy Ghost (whereby the world was to be convinced of the presence of God in the Church of Christians), these indeed depend upon the Ascension of Christ; but without the invisible operation of the Holy Ghost no man ever came to salvation from the beginning (supposing this for the present, but not granting it, if any man that is a Christian demand proof for it); though this be true, yet it was not expressly promised by God, nor expressly covenanted for by man, till the publishing of Christianity upon the Ascension of Christ. Therefore the baptism of repentance which John preached, was without question effectual to the remission of sins; as the Gospels propose it, Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3:—(for if I maintain the salvation of those, who, living under the Law, understood the covenant of grace to be folded up in it, by the preaching of the Prophets, much more easily can I maintain the salvation of those, who have embraced the baptism of repentance for remission of sins which John preached, pro-

° See below c. xi. last §: and in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vii. § 1.

<sup>p</sup> Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Truth, c. iii. § 3—8.

vided that they came to Christ, to whom John Baptist sent his <sup>9</sup> disciples, so soon as the command of Christianity should take place, and not otherwise:—but not by virtue of the covenant of grace published, which it was not to be till the Ascension of Christ, but by virtue of the covenant of grace veiled under the Law, which was not unveiled as yet, during the time of passage from the Law to the Gospel, when the baptism of John might take place. Neither was the baptism of John in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost; which baptism our Lord never established till after His rising again, Matt. xxviii. 19; but in the name of “Him that was coming<sup>9</sup> :” as St. Paul saith to the disciples, [δ’ Ἐρχόμενος.] Acts xix. 4, “John truly baptized the baptism of repentance, saying to the people, that they should believe on Him that was coming after him, that is, in Christ Jesus :”—which words some have endeavoured to set upon the rack, and to pull them from those which follow—“but they, hearing this, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus,”—as if they were not St. Luke’s words, but St. Paul’s, speaking of St. John’s hearers, that “they were baptized by him in the name of the Lord Jesus.” A thing altogether unreasonable to imagine,—that the disciples of John should make a question, whether our Lord Jesus were the Christ or not, as Matt. xi. 2, Luke vii. 18, if they had been from the beginning baptized in His Name. And the words might have served to repress this conceit in them that had submitted to take the meaning from the words; for it is, “ἀκούσαντες δὲ,” not

[Acts xix.  
5.]

<sup>9</sup> “Neither find we it (the baptism of John) administered in any form of words, not so much as in the Name of Christ to come, as many dream,” (viz., Gabriel, Sotus, Scotus, &c., from Lombard.) Jer. Taylor, Life of Christ, Pt. I. § ix.; Works, vol. ii. p. 183. ed. Heber. The Schoolmen seem to have borrowed the idea from S. Ambrose, De Spir. Sancto, lib. i. c. 3. § 41; Op., tom. ii. p. 608, B. See Maskell on Holy Baptism, p. 290.

<sup>9</sup> Beza, In Act. xix. 5.—“There can be no such thing gathered out of that place” (of Acts xix. 4, 5); “for those words in the 5th verse, ‘When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus,’ are part of the narration which Paul maketh of John’s baptism: so that the

sense is this, they that heard John’s doctrine, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. It is not so to be read, as though they were baptized againe of Paul, but he laith only his hands upon them that had before received the baptisme of John.” Willet’s Synopsis Papismi, Controv. xii. Quæst. 7. p. 584. (4th edition, folio, Lond. 1614). See also Bellarmine, De Baptismo, lib. i. c. 22. (Op., tom. ii. p. 380. A—C.); and above, in Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Ch. Truth, c. iii. § 4. Calvin is driven to argue (Instit. IV. xv. 18), that the “Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus is nothing else than the imposition of hands by St. Paul :”—“hac posteriore locutione describitur qualis ille fuerit Baptismus.”





is promised by our Lord in the Gospel to supply the want of His bodily presence; and therefore, when He declared unto them His departure, and not much afore it. Which things if they be true, of necessity the promise of the Holy Ghost is annexed to the precept of being baptized, given by our Lord at His departure, and from that time to take place. Neither is the meaning of His commission in the words alleged, that they should first teach, and then baptize<sup>u</sup> (though teaching that which Christianity professeth, is necessarily presupposed to baptizing, namely, that catechizing which I spoke of afore<sup>v</sup>); but that they should make men disciples by baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, limiting thereby the quality of disciples, to which the Holy  
 10 Ghost is promised, to those who should have received the sacrament of baptism, and so been made disciples. Seeing then it appears so plentifully, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, promised by our Lord a little before His departure to supply His bodily presence, is limited by Him to the sacrament of baptism; of necessity, that new birth by water and the Holy Ghost, which our Lord's words to Nicodemus require of all that shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, dependeth upon the sacrament of baptism: whatsoever Nicodemus might understand by the term of water, at the time when our Lord spake them, and this promise was not published. Of which I shall have occasion to say more in another place<sup>w</sup>.

§ 9. Neither will it be to the purpose to object, that it is the actual assistance, and not the habitual gift of the Holy Ghost, that regenerateth (supposing for the present, but not granting, that which all that pretend to Christianity do not acknowledge); and, therefore, that the promise of the Holy Ghost to succeed upon baptism, no way obligeth us to understand that water, which, with the Holy Ghost, regenerateth, of the water

<sup>u</sup> "Those and no other the Lord appointed to be baptized, who have been made disciples. But this cannot be said of infants. . . . The argument is confirmed from John iv. 2, where it is said that 'Jesus made more disciples,' then that 'He baptized:' first it is said that He 'made disciples,' then 'baptized.'" *Tombes, Exercitation concerning Infants*— 23. 24.  
 410. 1646.—<sup>v</sup>  
 thereto discen  
 prove, that

all nations and baptize them,' His meaning is, by 'preaching the Gospel to all nations,' make them disciples, and baptize them that become disciples of all nations." *Id., ibid., p. 127.*—So also Gale subsequently, in his *Reflections upon Mr. Wall's Hist. of Inf. Baptism*, Letters vii. and viii.

<sup>w</sup> Above, Bk. I. Of the Principles of Christian Truth, c. vii. § 11. *sq.*

<sup>x</sup> Below, c. xi. last §; and Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vii.

**BOOK** of baptism. For the actual assistance of the Holy Ghost, re-  
**II** generating a man to become a Christian, may well be under-

[John iii.  
6—8.]

[Isa. lv. 1;  
John iv.  
14; vii.  
38; Rev.  
xii. 17.]

stood to go before the habitual gift of the Holy Ghost upon baptism: (and in my opinion is to be understood, when our Lord goes on and says;—"That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit; marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again; the wind bloweth where it listeth, and ye hear the noise of it, but cannot tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Holy Ghost:") and, therefore, what shall hinder water and the Holy Ghost to signify one and the same thing in this place, the cleansing virtue and operation of the Holy Ghost being often signified under the figure of water in the Scriptures? So that "water and the Spirit" may well stand here for no more than the Spirit that cleanseth\*. I say, all this will not serve the turn. For the habitual gift of the Holy Ghost being promised Christ's disciples upon His departure to enable them to make good what they undertake by being His disciples, it is manifest, that the actual assistance of the Holy Ghost, regenerating to Christianity, only prepares the way for it. Seeing then that the gift of the Holy Ghost depends upon the water of baptism, it is manifest, that the cleansing virtue of God's Spirit, in the new birth of sinners, comes not to effect without the same.

§ 10. I will further draw into consequence those texts of Scripture which I alleged in the first Book<sup>y</sup>; to shew, that there was a certain rule of Christianity delivered by the Apostles, and acknowledged by them that undertook to be Christians: for there are some of them that signify plain enough, that this acknowledgment was made at their baptism, as the condition which it presupposed. When St. Paul thanketh God for the Romans, that they had "obeyed from

\* See Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. vii. § 1.—"Hic quoque, cum Christus Spiritum cum aqua conjungit, nihil aliud quam spiritualement aquam intellexisse videtur." Socin., De Bapt. Aquæ, c. iv.; Op. tom. i. p. 718. b.—"Per aquam et Spiritum: quasi diceret, per Spiritum qui purgando et irrigando fideles animas vice aquæ fungitur. Aquam ergo et Spiritum simpliciter accipio pro Spiritu Qui aqua est." Calvin., Instit., lib. IV. c. xvi. § 25; Op. tom. ix. p. 361. b.

—And from Calvin, (to name only two out of many,) Fulke, Confut. of Rhem. Transl., in John iii. 5; p. 262. Lond. 1633; and P. du Moulin the elder, Bouclier de la Foy, P. II. sect. xxi. pp. 122, 123. Genev. 1619. And see Hooker, E. P., V. lix. 1—4; in answer to Cartwright: and Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bapt., Pt. II. c. vi. § 1.

<sup>y</sup> Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Truth, c. vii. § 3—6.



the heart that form of doctrine which had been delivered them," Rom. vi. 17; what is this 'obeying from the heart,' but that 'answer or stipulation of a good conscience' towards God in baptism, which, St. Peter saith, "saveth us," as you have seen? And St. Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13 [14]: "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of eternal life, to which also thou wast called, and madest a good profession before many witnesses; I charge thee before God That quickeneth all things, and Christ Jesus That witnessed the good profession under Pontius Pilate, that thou keep the command unspotted and blameless, unto the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." What "profession" was it that our Lord died to witness, but that He was ordained by God the King of them whom He was sent with the Gospel to save? In regard whereof He is called by the Apostle, Heb. iii. 1, "the Apostle and High-Priest of our profession;" because He bore the cross afore us, to witness that righteous cause, which we are to maintain by bearing the same. And what is that "profession" which Timothy made afore many witnesses, but that of bearing Christ's cross when he was baptized? And what is the "commandment" which he is charged to keep "unspotted and blameless," but that Christianity which he became charged with at his baptism? Wherefore, when St. John allegeth "an unction from the Holy One," even our Lord  
 11 Christ, which teacheth Christians all things, so that they  
 need not be taught to avoid the heresies of that time, because they knew the truth; but withal chargeth them to 'abide in that which they had learned from the beginning,' and in that 'unction which teacheth them all things:' he sheweth us manifestly, that the unction of the Holy Ghost is granted by our Lord Christ to teach us all things which we have learned; to wit, that we be not seduced from that which we have learned from the beginning of our Christianity.

CHAP.  
II.

[1 John ii.  
20, 24,  
27.]

§ 11. Now, as it hath appeared, that this Christianity was then learned and acknowledged in order to baptism, so likewise, that the gift of the Holy Ghost dependeth upon the same. Otherwise, what shall we say to St. Peter ascribing remission of sins to baptism, Acts ii. 38? What shall we say to Ananias exhorting St. Paul, Acts xxii. 16, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the

The effects  
of baptism  
according  
to the Apo-  
stles.

BOOK  
II.

Lord?" What shall we say to St. Paul, affirming, that "as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," Gal. iii. 27; and that "those that are baptized into Christ, are baptized into His death," Rom. vi. 3? which is to say, that God on His part granteth them power to perform that, which they on their part profess to undertake. And again, Eph. v. 25, 26; "Christ gave Himself for His Church, that He might sanctify it by cleansing it with the laver of water through the Word." And again, Titus iii. 5, 6; "Not by works of righteousness which we had done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured upon us plentifully, through our Saviour Jesus Christ." And the Apostle to the Hebrews, x. 22, 23: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts cleansed from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water; let us hold fast the profession of faith without declining from it." What starting hole is here left for him that had not a mind to prefer his own prejudices before the word of God, to avoid the evidence of these testimonies for the concurrence of baptism to the qualifying of a Christian for the promises of the Gospel? What room is there left, so to interpret and understand justification by faith alone, or the nature of that faith which alone justifieth, that a man may be thought to be engrafted into Christ by a living faith before and without being baptized? He that admitteth St. Peter's distinction, shall not need to marvel, that God should appoint the cleansing of the soul to depend upon the washing of the body; seeing the profession of true Christianity, obliging him that is baptized both to God and to His Church (the power of baptizing into which is the power of remitting sins by the keys of the Church, as I proved in due place<sup>a</sup>), by the same appointment annexed to the same. And upon this ground it is that St. Paul says, 1 Tim. v. 8, that "he who provides not for his own, especially for his family, hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel:" because that Christianity to which he is tied by his baptism, obliges him to it. And the Apostles, Jude 4, 2 Pet. ii. 1, affirm, that the

[“κατέχω-  
μεν τὴν  
δμολογίαν  
· · ἀκλι-  
νή.”]

<sup>a</sup> Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Truth, c. ix. § 5—7.



Gnostics<sup>a</sup> did "deny the Lord Jesus Christ that bought them:" who certainly renounced not the profession of Christians which they counterfeited, but lived not according to it. Whereupon we read in St. Paul of those that "retain a fashion of godliness, but deny the power of it," 2 Tim. iii. 5: and that "profess to know God" (doubtless as Christians, if of Titus his charge), "but deny it by their works," Titus i. 16.

CHAP.  
II.

## CHAPTER III.

THE EXHORTATIONS OF THE APOSTLES THAT ARE DRAWN FROM THE PATTERNS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, SUPPOSE THE SAME. HOW THE SACRAMENTS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS ARE THE SAME, HOW NOT THE SAME. HOW THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE NEW COVENANT ARE BOTH ONE. THE FREE WILL OF MAN ACTETH THE SAME PART IN DEALING ABOUT THE NEW COVENANT, AS ABOUT THE OLD. THE GOSPEL A LAW.

BESIDES all this, I argue the same from the Old Testament, as the passages of it are employed and expounded by our Lord and His Apostles in the New. St. Paul enforceth the observing and fulfilling of our Christian profession, specially not to communicate in the worship of idols, thus: 1 Cor. x. 6—11: "These things came to pass for patterns to us, that we should not lust for evil things, as they also lusted; nor be idolaters, as some of them; as it is written, 'the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play;' nor go a whoring, as some of them did, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand; nor tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed by serpents; nor murmur, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer: now all these things happened to them for figures, and are written for our warning, on whom the ends of the world are come." If these things fell out to the fathers, that they might be figures for Christians, and that they were punished for transgressing the covenant which they had made with God; is it not manifest, that the punishments which the Apostle threateneth Christians with, must come for transgressing the second covenant of grace, which the Gospel introduc

The exhortations of the Apostles that are drawn from the patterns of the Old Testament, suppose the same.

BOOK § 2. Consider again the Apostle's argument, Heb. iii. 7—  
 II.

13: "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, 'To day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as at the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness, when your fathers tempted Me, proved Me, and saw My works forty years; wherefore I was wroth with that generation, and said, They always err in heart, and know not My ways; so that I have sworn in My wrath, that they shall not enter into My rest:' take heed, brethren, that there be not in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God; but exhort one another every day, while it is called to day, that none of you be hardened with the deceit of sin." It is manifest, that his intent is, to warn them of the crime of apostacy, in renouncing Christianity for the persecutions which the Jews then followed them with: as the whole epistle witnesseth; and here the very terms of "an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God," do evidence. And therefore in the end of the chapter,—“Who did He swear should not enter into His rest, but those that were disobedient? and we see they could not enter for unbelief.” “*Τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν*”—“those that were disobedient” to God's law, which they had plighted their faith to keep, “could not enter into His rest” of the land of promise, “*δι' ἀπιστίαν*”—“for unbelief,” or “unfaithfulness,” whether you will. Therefore, they that depart from God, having undertaken the profession of Christianity, shall not enter into His everlasting rest of the kingdom of heaven, whether for “unbelief,” or “unfaithfulness.” For as they are disloyal to their promise, so, by apostacy, they fall into the condition of infidels. Can this argument proceed upon any other terms? And, proceeding upon these, doth it not suppose an engagement claiming loyalty? Is not “the rest” of Christians, which he mentioneth, as clearly the kingdom of heaven, as “the rest” whereof the Psalm speaks was the land of promise? Wherefore he inferreth upon the words quoted, “For we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold the ground of our confidence,” or “the principle of our expectation, firm to the end:” the “ground of a Christian's confidence,” or, “that from whence his expectation of the promise commences,” which he calls “*ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως*,” being

[Heb. iii.  
18, 19.]

[Heb. iv.  
9.]

[Ps. xcv.  
11.]  
[Heb. iii.  
14.]

nothing else but the condition which he undertaketh upon supposition of God's promise<sup>b</sup>. C H A P.  
III.

- 13 § 3. Wherefore St. Paul thus inferreth the warning afore rehearsed, 1 Cor. x. 1—5: "Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them; now the Rock was Christ: but with most of them God was not well pleased; for they were felled in the wilderness." Did you ever read in the Old Testament, that the Israelites were baptized; because they passed the sea, under the cloud, without a drop of water to wet them with? But this we read, that God, by Moses, had delivered them, and thereupon they agree to leave Egypt under his conduct. Hereupon ensues the drowning of their enemies in the Red Sea, while they are protected thereby, with the cloud also over their heads. This therefore was the beginning of that people's engagement to God, under the conduct of Moses. Which though by and by they departed from at Marah and elsewhere, mutinying against Moses, yet, being reconciled to God by His patience and goodness in fulfilling their desires, they also took upon themselves to obey Him, and to keep the Sabbath, Exod. xv. 25, 26; xvi. 27—29. Until, being come to mount Sinai, they received the decalogue, and afterward the whole Law, as it was renewed by Moses a little before his death; though in effect they had submitted to whatsoever should be required in God's name by Moses, when they passed the Red Sea under his conduct. Only it is to be observed, that the covenant of circumcision, which God had made with Abraham when He gave him the land of promise, remained for their title to it, when the promise thereof became limited by the Law; which limitation because they submitted to, by leaving Egypt under the conduct of Moses, and being shadowed by the cloud saw their enemies drowned

<sup>b</sup> "Ἐδωκεν τὴν ἀρχὴν, nempe τὴν ὑπόστασιν; scil. principium, i. e. res a qua inchoatur aliquid, vel fundamentum. Alii" (e. g. Grotius, in loc.) "explicant, 'ἔδωκεν κατέσχευεν τὴν ὑπό-

στασιν ἐξ ἧς ἡρξάμεθα'—si modo firmiter teneamus confidentiam ejus jam fecimus initium." Wahl, Clavis N. T. Philol., —See also below, c



BOOK  
II.

How the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament are the same, how not the same.

in the Red Sea, therefore are they elegantly said by St. Paul to be "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." For if, being redeemed from the Egypt of this world, we undertake to leave it under the conduct of our Lord Christ; if hereupon our sins be drowned in the waters of baptism; were not they "baptized" in the same sense as we pass the Red Sea at our coming out of Egypt? But both upon supposition of the correspondence between the two Testaments, without which all this argument could neither have force nor relish.

§ 4. And therefore I cannot but admire to see men learned in the Scriptures to maintain by this place, that the sacraments of the Old Testament are the same with the sacraments of the New<sup>c</sup>; not distinguishing, whether immediately, or by way of correspondence. For if you make the kingdom of heaven and the land of promise all a thing, then is baptism and the passage of the Red Sea all one. But then it will be all one to believe in Christ and to submit to His conduct to paradise, as to believe in Moses (as the Israelites did hereupon, Exod. xiv. 31,) and to put themselves under his conduct to the land of promise; which is my argument. But if, setting aside the correspondence, you make their engagement to God under Moses for obtaining the land of promise one thing, and our engagement to God under Christ, another; certainly the immediate assurance of this, and the immediate assurance of that (which by means of the correspondence becomes also the assurance of this), are several things. And if there be between the old and new covenant that correspondence which makes that the figure of this, they may as well be said to be one and the same (and, by consequence, the sacraments of them), as a man's picture

<sup>c</sup> "Scholasticum autem illud dogma, . . . quo tam longum discrimen inter Veteris ac Novæ Legis sacramenta notatur, perinde ac si illa non aliud quam Dei gratiam adumbrarint, hæc vero præsentem conferant, penitus esplodendum est. Siquidem nihilo splendidius de illis Apostolus quam de his loquitur, quum docet 'Patres eandem nobiscum spiritualem escam manducasse:' et escam illam Christum interpretatur. . . . Quicquid ergo nobis hodie in Sacramentis exhibetur, id in suis olim recipiebant Judæi, Christum scilicet cum spiritualibus suis divitiis." Calvin, Instit. IV. xiv. 23; Op., tom. ix. p. 348,

b.—"Error est sacramenta Novæ Legis differre a sacramentis Veteris Legis penes efficaciam significationis." Luther, Lib. de Babyl. Captiv., cap. de Baptismo; Op., tom. ii. p. 75.—"The sacraments of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were for substance the same with those of the New." Westminster (and Scotch) Conf. of Faith, c. xxvii. § 5; from 1 Cor. x. 1—4.—"Paulus diserte docet, Israelitas re habuisse eadem sacramenta quæ nobis Christus tradidit." Whitaker, Defens. cont. Duræum, lib. viii. § 59; Op., tom. i. p. 189. a.

is called by his name; when, seeing the pictures of our princes, for example, we say, this is Henry the Eighth, and this Queen Elizabeth. But to say, that the sacraments of the old law do immediately figure or assure the same thing which the sacraments of the Gospel do, is the same thing as to say, the rest of the land of promise, and the everlasting rest of the kingdom of heaven, are both one and the same.

§ 5. Let us now see, by what right, that is, upon what ground, St. Paul argues that concerning the Gospel from the words of Moses, Deut. xxx. 11—14, which is manifestly said by him concerning the Law: Rom. x. 6—10: "The righteousness that is of faith saith thus: Say not in thine heart, who  
14 will ascend into heaven? to wit, to bring down Christ; or, who will go down into the deep? to wit, to bring up Christ from the dead: but what saith it? the word is near thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach; that, if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe with thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart a man believes to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made to salvation." The argument is this: if Moses duly warn the Israelites, that they have no excuse for not obeying the Law, which he had put, as it were, in their mouths and into their hearts, so plainly had he taught it them; then cannot those that hear the Apostles preach the Gospel, excuse themselves in not obeying it; being so plainly shewed, that 'if they profess Christ with their mouths, believing with the heart that God raised Him from the dead, they should be saved:'—that this 'word of faith' is put, as it were, 'in their mouths and in their hearts.' Can this be made good to be Moses his meaning, not supposing that the Spirit of God intended the Gospel by the Law? Or can it be denied so to be, supposing it? If, therefore, the profession of an Israelite tie him to the law of God given the Jews, shall not the profession of a Christian tie him to the law of God given the Christians? Shall not the professing of Christ, which the Apostle speaks of, be the undertaking of it? For St. Paul, by saying that they were "baptized into Moses under the cloud and in the sea," plainly sheweth, that as their undertaking to march under the conduct of Moses towards the land

CHAP.  
III.



BOOK  
II.

of promise through the Red Sea, was rewarded by God with the drowning of their enemies and the overshadowing of the cloud; so our undertaking to follow Christ towards that kingdom which He obtained by His cross, is rewarded with the extinguishing of sin and the refreshing of the Holy Ghost, in our travel to the world to come. And therefore, the engagement of the second covenant being enacted and settled upon us by the sacrament of baptism, the promises of the covenant must needs depend upon the same.

How the  
New Tes-  
tament  
and the  
New Cove-  
nant are  
both one.

§ 6. What else shall the name of a new covenant, or a new testament, signify, if we will not have them to signify nothing? Some man perhaps may marvel whence it comes, that, the agreement between God and His ancient people being always represented in the Old Testament in the nature and terms of a covenant, the New is, by the Apostle, proved to have the nature of the last will and testament of our Lord Christ, Heb. ix. 16, 17. But if this testament be also a covenant (as the same Apostle saith, Heb. viii. 6,—“He hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much He is the mediator of a better covenant, which is enacted upon better promises”), there will be no cause to marvel. The Greek word *διαθήκη*, in ordinary Greek, signifies no more than a man’s last will and testament; but in the use of the Jews that spoke Greek, such as are the Apostles, the translators of the Old Testament into Greek, and others, it signifies also a covenant<sup>d</sup>. If further it pleased God, that our

<sup>d</sup> “ברית, *foedus* sive *pactum* est, quod Græce *συνθήκη* dici posset. Verum auctores sacri pro *συνθήκη* appellant *διαθήκη*, quod verbum proprie *testamentum* sonat (nisi quod raro etiam apud profanos ponitur pro *pacto*, sicut observavit Joachimus Camerarius): unde libros Sacros *Vetus* et *Novum Testamentum* solemus dicere, cum, si Latine loqui velis, *Vetus* et *Novum Foedus* dicendi sint. At hic autor Hebraici verbi vim non perpendens, cum Græce scriberet (nam Græce scriptam esse hanc Epistolam vel ex hoc loco evinci potest: siquidem Hebraice nemo sic argumentari possit, ut ex *pacto testamentum* faciat et ideo *testatoris mortem* invehat), a Græco *διαθήκης* verbo duxit argumentum: quale fecit etiam in cap. 2. ubi pro Deo posuit *Angelos*.” Castalio in Heb. c. ix.

v. 16: ap. Crit. Sac., tom. iii. p. 4246. —“ברית, quod *pactum* significat sive *foedus* (est autem *foedus* non omne *pactum* sed publicum), Græci interpretes vertunt *διαθήκη*, et Latini *testamentum*, non illo speciali sensu Juris Civilis, sed generaliore, quia testatio est voluntatis. . . . Sed et *testamentum* illud ut in Jure Civili sumitur, ubi heredis institutioni, ut fieri solet, conditio additur, aut legatorum fidei commissorum onera, est *pactum* quoddam, et quidem eo nobilius quia morte testatoris secuta nullam jam mutationem recipit. Et propterea scriptor hic *pactum Dei novum*, quod perfectius esse debuit priore, vult esse etiam *testamentum* in illo significato potiore sive Juris Civilis. Propterea, inquit, *factus Christus* *μεσίτης* non veteris sed *novi pacti*, quia hoc

Lord Christ should die, to assure us of everlasting life on His part, which thereby He purchased, obliging God on His part to give it to those that shall be found qualified for it; well may the Apostle affirm, that it is the last will and testament of Him who died to make it irrevocable (because men's wills are not so till death). But it containeth nevertheless a covenant, because men become not sons of God by birth, but by choice; accepting the adoption which is tendered, being also their new-birth. Whereupon it follows, Heb. ix. 18, "Whence neither the first was dedicated without blood:" making the first covenant a testament also, because the sacrifices which it was dedicated with, signified the death of Christ, whose testament the new covenant is. Now every covenant, every contract whatsoever, is a law, which the parties interchangeably tie themselves to, being free before<sup>e</sup>: neither can it be a covenant, that imposeth nothing upon one of the parties.

§ 7. I know the promise of God not to destroy the world any more by water, is called many times His "covenant," and the rainbow the sign of it, Gen. ix. 9—17: whence it may be argued, that nothing hinders a covenant to be no more than  
15 a bare promise. And truly it is properly *διαθήκη*, that is, 'a disposition,' though by free promise. It is *ברית*, or 'a choice,' according to them that will have that to be the original of the word<sup>f</sup>. He that would be contentious, might have ground to dispute, that this promise of God was not without a condition annexed unto it. For the tradition of the Jews is now generally received by men of learning<sup>g</sup>, that God gave Noah and his sons seven precepts to observe; which were visible during the time that His people lived in the land of pro-

CHAP.  
III.

pactum novum non pecudum sanguine sed Ipsius *μεσίου* fuit sancendum. *Μεσίτης* est qui pacem inter partes efficit . . . Solet autem sæpe pax fieri sub certis legibus prius implendis quam pax valeat. Talis pax etiam *διαθήκη* est." Grotius in loc. See also Wolf, ad loc., in answer to Le Clerc: and Waterland, *Doctrine of the Eucharist*, c. xi.; Works, vol. vii. p. 320. Oxf. 1823.

<sup>e</sup> "Ὁ ἄρ στυλὴν νόμος ἐστὶν νόμος καὶ κατὰ μένος." Aristot., *Rhet.* I. xv. 21.

<sup>f</sup> " *ברית* f. *Fœdus*, Pactum, ab eligendo, quasi a *בָּרָה* vel *בָּרָא*, quia eli-

guntur personæ inter quas, et res ac conditiones propter quas, fœdus initur: aut a cædendo, quia victimæ cædi in fœderibus pangendis solebant; . . . quæ significatio etiam in *בָּרָא* fuit." Buxtorf, *Lex. Heb. et Chald.* The latter derivation is that usually given: and so Gesenius in voc.

<sup>g</sup> Selden, *De Jure Naturali et Gentium* juxta Disc. Ebræor., lib. i. c. x.; Op., tom. i. pp. 160—165. Lond. 1726: et alibi. See also Hammond on Acts xv. 29; and above, Bk. I. Of the Prince of Christ. Tr., c. xxiv. § 17.



BOOK  
II.

mise, as being the condition, upon the undertaking whereof strangers were protected by God's law among them. Which if it be true, it can no way seem unreasonable to say, that the undertaking of these precepts was the condition, upon which it pleased God to secure them from the waters of another deluge: reserving Himself nevertheless the liberty of destroying the world by fire, when that covenant which was to succeed this, and all the additions to it under Abraham or Moses, should have wrought the effect for which it was tendered, in the salvation of mankind. And thus it might be said, that the name of a covenant is properly attributed to this promise, because of the condition annexed, though not remembered in the Scripture. But, seeing the word covenant is manifestly used in the Scripture to signify a decree of God, or the declaration of it, as when it speaks of God's covenant with the day and the night<sup>b</sup>; I shall not need to ground myself upon any such nicety as this: provided and understood always, that the annexing of a condition necessarily determines and limits it to signify a contract, not a bare decree or promise. Which easily appeareth in the covenants whereof we speak, because they are treated. For to induce a man to embrace a promise, which being of advantage brings no burthen with it, is not for the wisdom of God to send His Son to do; because none but a madman can refuse it. But where God sends His Son to tender mankind terms of reconciliation, where He suffers death to undergo and execute His commission, where He sends His disciples, authorized by the evidence which His Spirit gives that He sent them, but obliged to undergo death in testimony of the same; there, I suppose, there is such a condition annexed, which they that have reason to be satisfied of the truth of the message, may doubt whether to make themselves parties to, by embracing the profession of it.

The free will of man acteth the same part in dealing about the new covenant as about the old.

§ 8. Hear the Apostle, 2 Cor. v. 18—20: "All is of God, That hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and given us the ministry of reconciliation; as, that God was about reconciling the world to Himself by Christ, not imputing to them their transgression, and placing in us the

<sup>b</sup> "Sciendum est, quod, licet ברית sit fœdus, pactum, vel firmamentum, aliquoties tamen multis in locis est lex. Est hoc quod dicitur in libro *Mechilta*

super illud Exodi 12, . . . non est ברית nisi lex sicut dictum est Deuteron. 29. (v. 1.)" Martini Pugio Fidei, P. II. c. iii. § 18: fol. 229. See also fol. 609.

ministry of reconciliation: we are therefore ambassadors in Christ's stead; as if God did exhort by us; in Christ's stead we beseech you, be reconciled to God." If all that is said in the Bible of the second and new testament or covenant of grace, imported no more but a bare promise, was mankind so void of reason as to need all this to persuade him to embrace his own happiness tendered without any reputed disadvantage? For though to forsake the world and ourselves be really an advantage to the most noble parts of human nature; yet, because that is not seen but by faith, not embraced without disadvantage in regard of the present world, that which is really a difficulty to the embracing of Christianity, I admit, as in the reputation of them to whom the Gospel is preached, to be a disadvantage. And therefore, with them to whom the Gospel is preached, the case is the same as with Cain, when God said to him, Gen. iv. 7, "If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted? but if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door:" as with the Israelites, when God said to them, Deut. xxx. 15, [16,] "Behold, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; whereas I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments, and statutes, and judgments, and thou shalt live, and increase, and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest in to possess it:" in fine, as with them to whom it is said, Eccles. xv. 14—17, "He made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel; keep the commandments and faith, if thou wilt; to do things acceptable to

16 Him: He hath set before thee fire and water, stretch forth thy hand to whether thou wilt; life and death is before man, and that shall be given him which he liketh." That is to say: so manifest as it is, that God, when He tendered the Law to the Israelites, tendered them their choice, whether they would undertake to live according to it, upon condition of obtaining the promises tendered with it; so evident is it, that God, tendering the Gospel in the same terms to all that are invited to undertake Christianity, tendereth it upon condition of living according to it: and, therefore, that as well in matter of Christianity (in the embracing or rejecting, in the performing or failing of it) the choice of free-will is evi-



BOOK  
II.The Gos-  
pel a law.

dently seen and exercised, as in any thing else wherein one man contracts with another; the nature and consideration of a covenant holding as fully in this as in human contracts.

§ 9. Which if it be true, we must not be nice in allowing the Gospel of Christ the name and nature of a law<sup>1</sup>; as indeed the name of The Law (though already possessed by the law of Moses), when it is put with some addition incompetent to the law of Moses, cannot be understood of any thing else. For if every contract be a law to the parties so soon as it is enacted, then can it not be denied, that the covenant of grace is a law to them that engage in it: unless we would have God tied by His promise, and Christians free from any obligation, yet nevertheless entitled to the same. For what is a law, but the condition, by observing whereof every man maintains his estate in the commonwealth whereof he is? Which he that would not have Christianity to be, in regard of the world to come, what would he have Christians to be but libertines and rebels? True it is, God imposeth it not as upon His subjects; but tendereth it as to His rebels, for the condition upon which they may become His subjects instead of His rebels. And that is a just reason, why it is called a covenant, rather than a law. And that reason justly reproves the Leviathan's imagination, that it can oblige neither more nor less than the law of nature<sup>k</sup>. For being positive, as tendered by the mere will of God, and upon what terms He pleased (as the precepts thereof, which are God's laws to His Church, and the institution of the Church itself, is merely positive), there is no reason at all to presume, that the moral precepts which are in force under it are bounded by the law of nature. Though, whether it be so or not, I undertake not here to determine. But we know what St. Paul saith, Rom. iii. 27: "Where is boasting? it is shut out: by what law? not by the law of works, but by the law of faith;" that is, by the Gospel, which requireth that faith, of which I am enquiring wherein it consists, for the condition of obtaining the promises which it tendereth. And St. James, ii. 8, 12: "If ye fulfil the royal law, which saith, Thou shalt love thy

<sup>1</sup> The text is here taken from the MS. It stands in the printed edition—"of a law; though the name of The Law (being already possessed by the

law of Moses)," &c.

<sup>k</sup> See above in Bk. I. Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 14.

neighbour as thyself, ye do well;" and, "So speak ye, and so do ye, as being to be judged by the law of liberty." For the liberty of being God's subjects, and under God's "royal law," the Gospel giveth. Neither is St. Paul otherwise to be understood, when he saith, Rom. viii. 2, "The law of the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, hath freed me from the law of sin and of death;" the embracing of the Gospel being the law, that is, the condition, upon which we become partakers of the Holy Ghost, free from sin and from death. And truly I cannot but pity the blindness of error, so oft as I remember, that I have heard Antinomians allege the words of the prophet, Jer. xxxi. 31—34, quoted by the Apostle to shew the difference between the first and second covenant, Heb. viii. 8—11:—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will settle with the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand, and brought them out of the land of Egypt (for they abode not in My covenant, and I neglected them, saith the Lord): for this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; putting My laws into their mind, I will also write them upon their hearts, and I will be to them for their God, and they to Me for My people; neither shall they teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all 17 know Me, from the least of them to the greatest." I say I cannot but pity them, that upon these words ground themselves, that the covenant of grace is a mere free promise; not only freely made, for so I say it is free, (for what but God's goodness moved Him to tender it?) but freely, without condition contracted for at their hands. For cannot God by His prophet foretell the effect of the covenant of grace, but He must be presumed to set down the terms of it? And if He express them not there, is He the less free to demand them when He tenders them? Especially, the covenant itself being to remain a secret, till God's time to reveal it. I say then, that this prophecy hath taken full effect in the lives of those, who, submitting themselves to the terms of Christianity, have received of God the gift of the Holy Ghost, to understand their profession, that they might live according to it; but



BOOK II. that this gift of the Holy Ghost, that is to say, the habitual assistance thereof, neither was due, nor bestowed, but upon supposition of Christianity professed by baptism, which God by our Lord Christ hath revealed to be the condition which He requireth of them that will enjoy the same.

#### CHAPTER IV.

THE CONSENT OF THE WHOLE CHURCH EVIDENCED BY THE CUSTOM OF CATECHIZING. BY THE OPINION THEREOF CONCERNING THE SALVATION OF THOSE THAT DELAYED THEIR BAPTISM. BY THE RITES AND CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM. WHY NO PENANCE FOR SINS BEFORE, BUT AFTER BAPTISM. THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVIDENT IN THIS CASE.

The consent of the whole Church evidenced [by the reason of the case.]

BUT I am now come to the argument, that is to be drawn from the practice of the universal Church to my purpose. And, truly, he that shall consider, for what reason the Apostles should require those whom they had converted, to be baptized, will find himself entangled in rendering it: unless he settle the ground of it upon the obligation of professing true Christianity; and the effect of it, in admitting to the unity of the Church, which may require the performance and maintain the exercise of it. And the consequence thereof, they that are or shall be employed by the Church to preach to unbelievers, will find to be such, that either they must insist upon the terms which I hold, with them, or they shall make them but equivocal Christians; that is, such as may wear the cross of Christ to man for a cognizance, but not in the obligation of their hearts to God, rather to suffer death than either to profess or act against that which He hath taught.

By the custom of catechizing.

§ 2. The next point in the visible practice of the Catholic Church, is the custom of catechizing<sup>1</sup>: the circumstances whereof, for time and manner, though no man can maintain to have been the same in all Churches, yet it may be argued to have been generally a time of trial, for them that had been won to believe the truth of Christianity, how they were likely to apply themselves to live like Christians, and what assurance

<sup>1</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Tr., c. vii. § 11—15.

or presumption the Church might conceive, that they would not betray the profession thereof. And therefore I appeal to the common sense of all men, whether they that exercised this course, did not admit men to Christianity and baptism upon the condition of professing and undertaking so to do.

§ 3. Besides those things which I alleged in the first Book<sup>m</sup>, in the Constitutions of the Apostles, in the most ancient canons of the Church, and generally in all Church writers, we read of *Missa Catechumenorum*, and *Missa Fidelium*; in English, ‘the dismissal of scholars,’ and ‘the dismissal of believers’<sup>n</sup>: because, during the Psalms, and during the reading of the Scriptures and expounding the same, reason was that learners should be present, as well for their instruction in Christianity, as for discharge of their duty in the praises of God and prayers to God: though the same prayers were not to be offered to God for learners as for believers, but they were to be dismissed with peculiar prayers of the Church for their particular estate, such as yet are extant in the ancient offices of the Church<sup>o</sup>. I say, there was reason for these orders, supposing that scholars were to be admitted Christians upon this presumption; otherwise none. And, hence it cometh, that, the assembly of the Church being first by a synecdoche called in Latin *Missa*, from the dismissing of it which it ends with<sup>p</sup> (as in Greek *Σύναξις*, in Latin *Collecta*, for the assembling of it<sup>q</sup>), the word *Missa* in Latin, as

<sup>m</sup> Bk. I. Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 12.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid., note r: and see Bingham, Antiq. of Christ. Ch., bk. XIII. c. i. § 2, 3; and Vicecomes, Observ. Eccles., De Missæ Ritibus, lib. ii. c. 2; tom. iii. pp. 94—96.

<sup>o</sup> Constit. Apost., lib. viii. c. 6; ap. Coteler., PP. Apostol., tom. i. pp. 397, 398. See Bingham, ibid., § 4: and Card. Bona, Rer. Liturg., lib. I. c. xvii. § 6; Op., pp. 400, 401. Antv. 1677.

<sup>p</sup> Setting aside the alleged Hebrew etymologies which have been forced on the word, and the Latin derivations of it, “a mittendis et conferendis in medium muneribus,” or “quod oblatio et preces ad Deum mittantur,”—“probabilissima est eorum sententia, qui missam dici volunt a missione seu dimissione populi, ut idem sit Missa quod Missio; sicut idem sunt apud veteres Collecta et Collectio, et Græce συλλογή et σέλλαξις, et peccati remissa et remis-

sio . . . Hæc sententia est Isidori, . . . Rabani, . . . Alcuini. . . Traductum est inde vocabulum ad alia significanda. . . . Imo accipitur simpliciter pro missione. . . . Ido accipitur pro divino officio lectionum, precum, et aliorum id genus, quod celebratur in Ecclesia ante dimissionem Catechumenorum. . . . IItio accipitur pro illa parte Liturgiæ quæ est ab Offertorio usque ad finem, quæ proprie dicitur missa fidelium. . . . IVto accipitur pro tota celebratione divini officii, in quo Eucharistia consecratur, et comprehendit simul missam catechumenorum et fidelium. . . . Vto accipitur pro ipsis collectis seu precibus quæ dicuntur in Liturgia.” Bellarm., De Missa, lib. i. c. 1; Op., tom. ii. pp. 938. A, 939. B.—See also Vicecomes, Observ. Eccl., De Missæ Ritibus, lib. i. c. 2; tom. ii. pp. 82—86.

<sup>q</sup> “Collecta, Σύναξις, sacrum Missæ sacrificium, ad quod Christiani coire et



BOOK  
II.

Σύναξις in Greek, is now come to signify the sacrament of the eucharist (which came after the dismissing of learners, but went afore the dismissing of believers), being the principal office for which the assemblies of the Church were held\*. But I will remit those that would understand the weight of this argument, to that which they may read in Clemens his *Pædagogus*†: where they shall find the conversation which the Church required of those who professed to be scholars of Christianity, and to stand for baptism, described in all the parts of it;—perhaps somewhat in the way of Plato his Commonwealth, or Xenophon's Education of Cyrus, expressing many times what should be, rather than what was; but still, what the Church, on the behalf of God, required at their hands;—till, being come to the end of the book, he who had approved himself by his conversation likely to make a good Christian, is, in the end of it, inducted by the catechist into the Church, to demand that baptism, which by this time he hath learned what it charges him with. And if this be not argument enough, what the Church in God's behalf demands of them that would be Christians, it will be in vain to apply reason to argue any thing that is questionable.

§ 4. For it is visible, that the time of any man's con-

colligi solent: populi ad sacra ecclesiarum officia peragenda conventus; atque adeo quodvis officium ecclesiasticum. Papias: *Collecta dicitur eo quod colligatur populus in unum, ut ostendat Christum in Evangelio venturum*. S. Hieronymus in Epitaph. S. Paulæ: *Post Alleluia cantatur, quo signo vocabantur ad Collectam*," &c. Ducange sub voce *Collecta*, num. 6. The modern sense of the term *Collect* is by some derived from this use of the word;—see Wheatly, p. 154. Oxf. 1839:—by others, as Bingham (*Antiq. of Chr. Ch.*, XV. i. 4), from a wholly different usage of it.

\* "Misse nomen Latinum, non Hebræum est, ut neoterici studiose exco- gitant. Isidorus Hispal. lib. Etymolog. 6. cap. 19. Alcuinus, De Divinis Officiis. Et Remigius, De Offic. Missar. Missa a præmittendo, vel emittendo, vel dimittendo, dicitur. Unde Ambrosius, lib. ii. Epist. 14, in Missa Catechumenorum utitur illa voce, dimissis catechumenis. Alii a gemina missione dictam existimant. Prima missio est catechumenorum, altera fidelium, quæ fieri solet peractis sacris, clamante Dia-

cono: ITE MISSA EST; hoc est, finita et completa est oblatio. Cassianus lib. ii. Instit. cap. 13. nocturnæ Missæ meminit: quod nihil aliud est quam dimissio, quæ fiebat a synaxi peracta et finita oratione. . . Unde recte auctor Chaconius Hispanus, sive alius, in notis Cassiani existimat apud Cassianum sumi Missam pro quacumque synaxi sive congregatione quam monachi publice orandi causa faciebant. . . Accipiebant vero nomen ab ipsa dimissione completa oratione. Nam, ut Smaragdus ait, 'orationes,' id est, collectæ, quæ in fine cursus a sacerdote dicuntur, Missæ, id est, Deo transmissæ dicuntur. Verum cum ex omnibus solennitatibus, sacrificiis, et oblationibus labiorum, quæ Deo in orbe terrarum fiunt, maxima oblatio sit sacrum Missæ, . . deinde per excellentiam Missa nominatur oblatio et sacrificium illud incrementum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi." E notis Garcie Loaisæ in Concil. xii. Tolet., ap. Bini Concil., tom. iii. P. i. fol. 279. 2. D.—F. Colon. Agripp. 1618.

† See Bk. I. Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 13. note s.

tinuing *catechumenus*, or a probationer in Christianity, was required upon no other ground, nor to any other purpose, but that the Church might be reasonably or legally (that is, according to custom) assured, that the party pretending to baptism was really resolved to stand to that, which Christianity should require at his hands. This, the conversation of several years for trial, the frequenting of God's service in the Church, the hatred which he needs must undergo from the enemies of the Church, Jews and Gentiles, must needs signify; supposing Christians to be reasonable people: but that exception which I alleged out of the Constitutions, most clearly,—that if any man's zeal to Christianity should be found so fervent, that there was no reason to suspect his sincerity, then the regular time of continuing in the state and rank of *catechumenus*, or a scholar of Christianity, might be abridged by the Church<sup>t</sup>. For this is the same consideration, which takes place in many penitential canons of the Church afterwards;—that if any man should demonstrate that zeal and eagerness in detesting the offences through which he had failed, which might ground a confidence of his sincerity for the future, the regular time of his penance might be abridged<sup>u</sup>. The ground whereof is to be seen in the example of St. Paul, abating the rigour of his censure upon the incestuous person at Corinth; though not only in consideration of the person's own zeal, but of the Church's sub-

[1 Cor. v. 3—5;  
2 Cor. ii. 6—10.]

§ 5. Consider further another custom of the Church during this primitive estate. Many men that were convicted in their judgments of the truth of Christianity, finding difficulty in undergoing the cross of Christ and persecution for Chris-

By the opinion thereof concerning the salvation of those that delayed their baptism.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid., § 12.

<sup>u</sup> "Quoties vehementem animi conversionem et poenitentiam in peccatore animadvertabant, indulgentius eum habebant, tempusque illud longum asperæ poenitentiae pro animadversa contritionis vehementia contrahebant, et asperitatem mitigabant. Ita faciendum

passim monent Patres et præcipiunt canones. Concilium Nicæen. primum cap. 12. . . . Concilium Ancyran., c. 5. . . et Laodicea, can. 2. . . . Concilium in Trullo canone ultimo." Morinus, De Poenitentia, lib. i. c. 15. pp. 37. a—38. b: who establishes the position at length.



BOOK  
II.[Clinical  
baptism.]

tianity, at least willing to avoid it, though they went so far as to profess themselves probationers in Christianity, yet went not so far as to pretend to baptism, lest by being admitted to it they should make themselves liable to persecution as Christians. These men, if any thing fell out to make them think their lives to be in danger, would, nevertheless, desire to be baptized in their beds of sickness. Neither did the Church make any question of granting it<sup>x</sup>; presuming that those, who by the hand of God had been driven to demand it, would prove true to that, which by such an exigent they<sup>19</sup> had been driven to seek. Nevertheless, these are those *clinici*, whom we read of in the ancient records of the Church; of whose salvation though there were that presumption, in regard whereof they were admitted to baptism, yet not without some scruple. Upon what account? Not because they were not so well drenched with water, being baptized in their beds, as others; but because their resolution to abide by the Christianity which they professed at their baptism, was counted more questionable than theirs, who had frankly without reservation abandoned themselves to it.

[Tertul-  
lian's doc-  
trine.]

§ 6. Tertullian, in his book *De Bapt.*, cap. xviii.<sup>y</sup>, argues, that none should make haste to baptism, that are not provided of that resolution, which the performance of that which they undertake by it requires. And upon this account he advises to delay the baptism of infants to man's estate; nay, of single persons, because of the temptations to which they are subject, till they resolve to serve God either in the state of virginity and widowhood or of wedlock<sup>z</sup>. What the consequence hereof is in the matter of baptizing infants, his reason must determine. And that sufficiently appears to be upon the profession which baptism undertaketh. For that which he apprehendeth is, that not having well understood

<sup>x</sup> See above, Review of Right of Ch. in a Chr. State, c. i. § 28, 29; and notes d, e, f.

<sup>y</sup> "Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipue tamen circa parvulos. . . Veniant ergo dum adolescent, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad

remissionem peccatorum? . . . Non minore de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentie corroborentur." Tertull., *De Baptismo*, c. xviii. pp. 231. D, 232. A. ed. Rigalt. Paris. 1664.

<sup>z</sup> See Bk. I. Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. xxiii. § 37. 44.

and digested what it is they undertake, they should fail in making it good. CHAP.  
IV.

§ 7. And truly let any man tell me, why there should be so much doubt made of the salvation of those that died before baptism in the ancient Church, notwithstanding that they had professed, not only to believe the truth of Christianity but also that they intended to undertake the profession of it, and were indeed of the rank of *catechumeni*, scholars or probationers in it. For it is manifest, that after persecution was ceased, there were many and many, who, professing Christianity, forbore nevertheless to be baptized, sometimes many years, sometimes till death (as we see by the great Constantine, who, having professed so long before the belief of Christianity, was not baptized, nevertheless, till a while before his death <sup>a</sup>); sometimes therefore were prevented by death, and died unbaptized; of whose salvation there was some difficulty made in conceiving full assurance; as it appears by the arguments, wherewith St. Ambrose comforts himself in the case of the Emperor Valentinian, and his brother Satyrus <sup>b</sup>. Not that there could remain any doubt in the salvation of those, who, having resolved to undertake and profess Christianity by being baptized, should be intercepted and cut off by inevitable casualties of mortality, not procured by those delays, which the want of zeal in that resolution had brought to pass. For it is clear, that those who suffered death in the profession of Christianity, left no doubt in the mind of any Christian, whether they should be saved or not, suffering for Christ before they were baptized <sup>c</sup>. But because those who might have had means and opportunity to be baptized, at such times, and upon such occasions, as the rules and customs of the Church furnished, by

[Catechumens who died unbaptized.]

\* Euseb., De Vita Constantini, lib. IV. cc. lxi.—lxiii.: pp. 557, 558. ed. Vales.—Socrat., Hist. Eccl., lib. I. c. xxxix. p. 75. ed. Vales.—Sozom., Hist. Eccl., lib. II. c. xxxiv. p. 496. ed. Vales.

<sup>b</sup> S. Ambros., De Obitu Valentin., cc. 30, 52, 53, 77; Op., tom. ii. pp. 1182. E, 1188. C—E, 1194. A; De Excessu Fratris Sui Satyri, cc. 42, 48; ib., pp. 1125. C, D. 1127. C. Satyrus was baptized before his death, but undertook a dangerous voyage and was nearly shipwrecked while yet unbap-

tized, having deferred his baptism until he was advanced in life. See the note of the Benedictine editors on c. 48. of the tract of St. Ambrose last quoted.

<sup>c</sup> "Ὁ δὲ ἀξιώθεις μαρτυρίου, χαίρετω τὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ χαράν. . . κἀν κατηχούμενος ἦ, ἄλυπος ἀπίτω· τὸ γὰρ πάθος τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, ἔσται αὐτῷ γνησιώτερον βάπτισμα." Constit. Apostol., lib. v. c. 6; ap. Coteler., PP. Apostol., tom. i. p. 307. And see Bingham, Antiq. of Christ. Ch., X. ii. 20.



BOOK  
II.

neglecting the same, ministered some ground to presume, that they had not in them that resolution to undergo the cross of Christ (in and for the performance of that which baptism undertakes), in consideration whereof He grants those promises which His Gospel proclaimeth. And having said this, I conceive I need say no more, to shew the necessity of baptism according to the doctrine and practice of the whole Church; which I proved afore by the Scriptures. For if those who professed to believe Christianity, and had resolved to enter into that estate and life which it required, came under a doubtful repute as to their salvation among Christians, where they were intercepted by death before they were christened by baptism; well may the unavoidable casualties of mortality dispense in the necessity of an act, the means whereof may depend upon something else beside his will that wants it; but it appears therefore a necessary ingredient in the condition which qualifies for the promises of the Gospel, when the desire of having it, if it were possible, appears absolutely indispensable.

§ 8. And this shall save me the labour of producing the testimonies of Church writers, to evidence the sense thereof in all ages. For the sense of the Church cannot be so effectually evidenced by the sayings of particular persons, of what authority soever in their own Churches, as it is evident<sup>20</sup> by the customs really in force, which it appeareth that particular persons held themselves obliged to follow. And therefore to the opinions presently on foot:—of the Socinians; that baptism was necessary under the Apostles, to profess that purity of life which Christianity promiseth, when men were converted from Jews or Gentiles to Christians, but indifferent for those that wear that profession by being born and brought up under Christian parents<sup>d</sup>: and of some Enthusiasts among us; who think it a mere mistake to baptize with water into Christianity, the baptism of John being the baptism of water, but the baptism of the Holy Ghost the baptism of Christ<sup>e</sup>: of which opinions you shall hear more by and bye<sup>f</sup>:—I say, to these opinions it shall serve my turn

<sup>d</sup> See above, c. i. § 7. note r.<sup>e</sup> Viz., Dell and Saltmarsh and their followers. See c. ii. § 4. note g; and

c. v. § 6.

<sup>f</sup> Below, c. v. § 6, 7.



to say, that the necessity of the baptism of water stands evidenced by the same means, that convince the world of the truth of Christianity; to wit, by the Scriptures hitherto alleged, and by the consent of all Christians. For it will be impossible to allege, not only any writer that hath been allowed and credited by the Church, but any man that hath passed for a Christian in the Church, that ever undertook to persuade himself, or any man else, to presume that he should be saved neglecting baptism. For what reason and upon what ground, I leave to those that shall neglect St. Peter's distinction hitherto pleaded, to allege.

§ 9. As for the next point, which is the manner of baptizing, from the circumstances and ceremonies of it, I shall but relate here what I alleged out of St. Peter in the beginnings, of the solemn questions propounded of course to those that demanded baptism: whether they did believe the truth of Christianity; whether they would undertake to profess it, and to fight against the flesh, the world, and the devil, for the observing of it; whether they desired to be baptized upon these terms. Neither shall I need to allege the testimonies of Church-writers, for the use of the same ceremony; which at this day is in force in the Church of England. And though there be those<sup>h</sup>, that are liberal enough in censuring it as impertinent, now that all are baptized infants, and though this be not the place to consider such exceptions, yet I will here take notice, how the contract thus executed concerns the salvation of Christians; that so it may be judged, how it concerns the office of baptism, that what so concerns the salvation of Christians be expressed in it.

§ 10. To the same purpose I will here allege the putting on of white robes after baptism; whereupon the Sunday after Easter day is still called *Dominica in Albis*, 'The Lord's day in whites' (which first they had put on at Easter when they were baptized<sup>i</sup>). Which custom seemeth to have been in use

CHAP.  
IV.

By the rites and ceremonies of baptism. [The interrogatories.]

[The putting on white robes after baptism.]

<sup>a</sup> Above, c. ii. § 5.

<sup>b</sup> "As for thys questioning, it can be little better termed than a very trifling and toying. For, first of all, children have not nor cannot have any faith," &c. Cartwright, Reply to Whitgift's Answer to the Admonition, p. 189.

—<sup>c</sup> "Now follow the corruptions in the Sacraments apart: and first of those in

Baptism, where in mayntenance of the questions, ministered to young infants which cannot answer; he would make us beleieve," &c. Id., Rest of the Second Reply against Whitgift, c. iv. p. 244. 4to. 1577. And see Hooker, E. P., V. lxiv.

<sup>i</sup> Bingham, Antiq. of Christ. Ch., XX. v. 12:—Vicecomes, Observ. Eccles.,

BOOK  
II.

in the Church, when St. Paul said (Rom. xiii. 14), "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfil it in the lusts thereof;" and (Gal. iii. 27), "As many as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ;" and (Ephes. iv. 22, 24), "To put off the old man, . . and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" and (Col. iii. [9,] 10), "Having put off the old man with his actions, and put on the new man that is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of Him that made him." For all these expressions seem to be allusions to that which they saw done and practised before their eyes. But those that yield not so much, cannot refuse to grant, that the custom was taken up by the Church to signify the profession of that which the Apostle enjoineth all Christians, in those that were baptized.

[The signing with the sign of the cross.]

§ 11. The same thing [was] signified by signing those that were baptized with the sign of the cross: which St. Augustin expounds very well by the custom of the Roman empire, to set a mark on the bodies of those that were listed soldiers, and upon slaves, by which they might be known and brought back, if they should run away, or depart from their colours<sup>k</sup>. For though the sign of the cross, made upon him that is baptized, remain not visible upon him, yet, being done publicly and solemnly, and, as St. Paul saith of Timothy, "under many witnesses," he is notwithstanding to be challenged by it of what he undertook. And he that observes this mark to be called by the ancient Church "*sigillum*"—"the sign or seal,"

[1 Tim. vi. 12.]

tom. i. De Bapt., lib. v. cc. 6—15. pp. 318—345.

<sup>k</sup> "Si quisquam sive desertor sive qui nunquam omnino militavit, nota militari privatum aliquem signet, nonne, ubi fuerit deprehensus, ille signatus pro desertore punitur, et eo gravius quo probari potuerit nunquam omnino militasse, simul secum punito, si eum prodiderit, audacissimo signatore?" S. Aug., Cont. Epist. Parmen., lib. ii. c. 13. § 29; Op., tom. ix. p. 45. A, B. "Tene ergo quod accepisti; non mutatur, sed agnoscitur: character est Regis mei, non ero sacrilegus; corrigo desertorem, non immuto characterem." Id., In Joh. Evang. Tract. vi. § 16; Op., tom. iii. P. ii. p. 337. D. "Et sic aliquos eorum, considerantes evidentiam veritatis et pulchritudinem

pacis, non baptismo quem jam sicut regalem characterem tanquam desertores acceperant sed fidei quæ illis defuit, . . . sociamus." Id., Ad Januar. Donatist., Epist. lxxxviii.; Op., tom. ii. p. 217. F. See also St. Chrysostom, In Epist. II. ad Cor. Hom. iii. in fin.; Op., tom. x. p. 454. B. ed. Bened.—"Καθάπερ γὰρ στρατιώταις σφραγίς, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς πιστοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπιτίθεται· κἄν λειποτακτῆσης, κατὰ δὲ ἄλλος γίνῃ πᾶσι."

<sup>l</sup> "Σφραγῖσαι est" (apud Patres) "*signum crucis imprimere*. . . Usitatissima hæc significatio." Suicer, Thes. sub voc. σφραγίζω. "I. Σφραγίς notat Baptismum." Id., ibid., sub voce σφραγίς. And see Meursius, Glossar. Græco-Barb., in voc. σφραγίς, σφραγίς (Op., tom. iv. p. 812. ed.



21 must think of St. Paul's words (2 Cor. i. 21, 22), "But He CHAP. IV.  
that establisheth us with you into Christ, and anointeth us,  
is God; Who hath also signed us, and put the earnest of His ["σφραγι-  
Spirit into our hearts;" and (Ephes. i. 13), "In Whom also σάμενος."]  
having believed, ye were signed with the Holy Spirit of ["σφρα-  
promise;" and (iv. 30), "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, γίσθητε."]  
by Whom ye are signed to the day of redemption." I say, ["σφρα-  
he must think of these words of St. Paul, as I said of those γίσθητε."]  
concerning the white robes of them that were baptized;  
that they are either allusions to that which men saw done  
by the appointment of the Apostles, or occasions of taking  
up these ceremonies by the primitive Church.

§ 12. I might here argue from the custom of undertakers <sup>m</sup> [Spon-  
(which now are called godfathers and godmothers) to the sors.]  
same purpose. For if it were requisite, that the Church  
should be secured by some of their own body, that they  
who demanded baptism were no counterfeits, but would  
stand to what they undertook; it ought to be an argument,  
that they were to undertake that which they give the Church  
security to perform. And indeed, this custom being nothing  
else but an appurtenance or consequence of the interrogatories  
of baptism, I need say no more, but that it appears thereby,  
what those that were admitted to baptism undertook; when  
they were to have sureties to undertake for them, that they  
dissembled not in that which they undertook.

§ 13. But, in the next place, I will allege the constitution  
of the Church, and all the authority of it; grounded (as by  
the means which I have employed to make evidence of it  
appeareth) upon supposition and presumption, that by being

Lami), quoted by Suicer: and Vicecomes, *Observ. Eccles.*, tom. i. De Bapt., lib. i. c. 3. p. 4; lib. ii. cc. 40, 41. pp. 189—193.

<sup>m</sup> "SUSCIPERE, dicuntur Patrini, qui baptizandum ad fontem deducunt et baptizatum de fonte excipiunt, et inde *Susceptores* appellati, Græcis ὑποδόχοι." Dufresne, *Glossar.* in voc. *Suscipere*. — "Dionysius Areopagita, lib. de Eccles. Hierarchia, c. vii. . . scribit desponsoribus, quos ille appellat παιδαγωγούς *paedagogos*, et ἀναδόχους *susceptores*, et καθηγμένους *duces*, puerorum illorum, quos a naturalibus ipsorum puerorum parentibus sibi traditos afferunt baptizandos, eo: que abrenunciationem malo-

rum et confessionem fidei facere dicunt: id est (ut ibi exponit Dionysius), promittunt se pueris illis, cum intelligere sacra per ætatem potuerint, suasuros, ut et nuncium mittant adversariis, et divinam confessionem faciant, in eaque perseverent. Sic sponsorum responsionem interpretatur ibi Dionysius. Qui eodem libro c. ii. etiam adultis baptismum accipientibus attribuit ἀναδόχους *susceptores*, quos etiam vocat ἡγέμενους *duces*, et χειραγωγούς *manuductores*." Forbes, *Instruct. Historico-Theolog.*, lib. X. c. v. § 22. *Genev.* 1680. See also Vicecomes, *Observ. Eccles.*, tom. i. De Bapt., lib. i. cc. 30—36. pp. 83—101.



BOOK  
II.

[“Κρινέτω.”  
Vulg.;  
Beza in  
note;  
Griesb.]

baptized into the visible communion thereof we attain invisible communion in the promises which the Gospel tendereth. There are some, that take upon them to censure the ancient Church for the abuse which I spoke of even now, in delaying of baptism. These men, if they will go always by the same weights and measures, must call St. Paul to account, why he makes this demand (1 Cor. v. 12, 13); “What have I to do to judge those that are without? do not ye judge those that are within? but those that are without, God shall judge.” For those who professed only to believe Christianity, though obliged to learn how to behave themselves like Christians (for with what face could they demand baptism otherwise), yet, to speak properly, were not Christians, were not of the Church. Therefore Clemens Alexandrinus, in the end of his *Pædagogus*, bringeth in the Word, that is, our Lord Christ, or His Gospel (which he calleth the *pædagogue*, for governing these children and novices in Christianity in their way to the Church), giving up this office to Himself (as being to become for the future their Doctor, and Master, and Bishop) at their entrance into the Church. The passage is remarkable. “Ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἐμὸν, φησὶν ὁ Παιδαγωγός, διδάσκειν ἔτι ταῦτα· διδασκάλου δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐξήγησιν τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων λόγων χρῆζομεν· πρὸς δὲ ἡμῖν βαδιστέον· καὶ δὴ ὧρα γε ἐμοὶ μὲν πεπαῦσθαι τῆς παιδαγωγίας, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἀκροᾶσθαι τοῦ διδασκάλου· παραλαβὼν δὲ οὗτος ὑμᾶς, ὑπὸ καλῇ τεθραμμένους ἀγωγῇ ἐκδιδάξεται τὰ λόγια· εἰς καλὸν δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἦδε, καὶ ὁ Νυμφίος, ὁ μόνος διδάσκαλος, ἀγαθοῦ Πατρὸς ἀγαθὸν βούλημα” — “But it is not for me to teach these things further, saith the *Pædagogue*; we have need of a doctor to expound these holy oracles, and to him we must go: and truly it is time for me to give over my office of *pædagogue*, and for you to become the doctor’s hearers: He, receiving you bred with good government” (having behaved themselves well during the time of their trial), “shall teach you these oracles: and in good time here is the Church, and the only doctor the Bridegroom, the good mind of a good Father<sup>n</sup>.” Christ, or the Gospel of Christ, is the “*pædagogue*,” that guides and governs children in Christianity to the school, that is, to the Church,

<sup>n</sup> Lib. iii. c. 12. p. 309. ed. Potter, who reads “*τετραμμένους*,” as does Heinsius. “*Τεθραμμένους*” seems to be

Thorndike’s own emendation. See above Bk. I. Princ. of Christ. Tr., c. vii. p. 118. note s.

to demand baptism, having behaved themselves well by the way during the time of their trial. When that is done, he teaches them no more as children are taught by a pædagogus; but, as a master teaches his scholars, so Christ those that are become His disciples by being baptized. Therefore afterwards; “*Εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἡμᾶς καταστήσας ὁ Παιδαγωγὸς, Αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ παρακατέθετο τῷ διδασκαλικῷ καὶ πανεπισκόπῳ Δόγῳ*”—“the Pædagogus, having set us in the Church, hath recommended us to Himself, the Word, the Doctor and Bishop of all.” And this is our Lord’s commission to His Apostles,—to make them disciples, that should take up His 22 cross, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; then, to teach them to observe all that He had given them in charge.

§ 14. The same is the ground of Cassander’s observation, which is much to my purpose:—that the Church putteth no man to penance, whatsoever his life may have been, for any thing done before baptism<sup>a</sup>. Zosimus thinks he lays a great imputation upon Christianity, in pretending that Constantine, finding no means to come clear of the blood of his wife Fausta, or his son Crispus, gave ear to Christianity, because it pretended to wash away all sin<sup>b</sup>. That Constantine should seek those means which heathenism pretendeth to purge sin with<sup>c</sup>, may well be thought to proceed from the malignity of the Gentiles against the first Christian prince. For the rest, not disputing of his doings before baptism, because the Church judgeth not those that are without (though he professed Christianity when they were done), it would be a disparagement to that fountain which God hath opened for Judah and Jerusalem, that there should be any sin which it cannot cleanse; supposing the change sincere, which the undertaking of Christianity professeth: if not, God is his judge. [Zech. xiii. 1.]

§ 15. But though the Church refuse no man baptism, [A mark set upon those that delayed their baptism.] because, professing Christianity, he had delayed his baptism; yet, as it appeared sufficiently by the scruple that was

<sup>a</sup> Ibid., p. 311.

<sup>b</sup> Cassander, Consultatio, art. vi. De Bonis Operibus Fidelium; Op., p. 922. fol. Paris. 1616:—“Hic observandum B. Ambrosium de ea justificatione loqui, quæ in baptismo et regeneratione contingit; cum impii, nulla habita anteaetæ vitæ et patratorum acelerum ratione, si modo resipiscant

et evangelio credant, per baptismum remissionem omnium peccatorum et donum Spiritus Sancti accipiunt. . . Nullâ requisitâ ab his pœnitentiæ operâ, nisi tantum ut credant.”

<sup>c</sup> Zos., Hist., lib. ii. c. 29; pp. 149, 150. ed. Heyne, Lips. 1784.

<sup>d</sup> Id., ibid.



BOOK  
II.

made of the salvation of those that died in that estate, that the Church disallowed it, so, when they were come into the Church, a mark of the authority of the Church was fastened upon them, in that those that were baptized in their beds were made incapable (by one of those canons which I spoke of in the first Book, that were in force before the Church had any canons in writing) of being promoted to the clergy\*. For this you shall find objected to Novatianus by Cornelius, in Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, vi. 43<sup>t</sup>: that, by the canons, he ought not to have been promoted to any rank in the clergy, because he had been baptized in his bed of sickness, having delayed his baptism for fear of persecution, till he found himself in danger of death. And though the Church put no man to penance for his life before baptism (because Christianity itself pretendeth a total change in him that embraceth it, and that the Church judgeth not but presumeth of the truth of that change, which is pretended by him that is without), yet it fasteneth a mark of the authority which it purchaseth upon Christianity, by providing that no man, who had been ever put to penance, should be promoted to any rank of the clergy". The reason is expressed in those words of Clemens his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 54, speaking of the Apostles;—"κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν . . . εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν"—"preaching over countries and cities, they made the first-fruits of them" (whom they had converted), "bishops and ministers of them that should believe<sup>x</sup>." The learned Blondell will have these "first-fruits" to signify those that were first converted to Christianity<sup>y</sup>:

\* See Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Tr., c. vii. § 29—36: and Review, c. i. § 29: and Bingham, IV. iii. 11.

<sup>t</sup> p. 245. ed. Vales. See above, Review, c. i. § 28. note e.

"Frequentissimum istud apud Latinos Patres axioma, Publice poenitentes non esse ordinandos." Morinus, De Pœnit., lib. IV. c. xiii. § 5. p. 196, 2. A. And see the entire chapter in Morinus; and Bingham, Antiq. of Chr. Ch., IV. iii. 6.

<sup>x</sup> S. Clem. ad Corinth. Epist. I. c. xlii. p. 54. ed. Jun. Oxon. 4to. 1633. —p. 144. ed. Jacobson, who corrects *καθίστανον* for *καθίστανον*.

<sup>y</sup> Apol. pro Sentent. Hieron. de Episcopis et Presbyteris, Sect. ii. § 1. p. 10. 4to. Amstelod. 1646: — "Apostolos

primitiis suis, id est, primis ad fidem vocatis, (si modo probabiles essent) ecclesiastica munera demandare solitos."

Both interpretations of the word *ἀπαρχή*, as used in the N. T., are given by the Fathers. "Primitiæ Achaïæ dicuntur Epænetus et Stephanus ad Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, quia primi Achæorum Christo crediderunt. . . Ita sentit Theodoretus, . . Chrysostomus, . . Theophylactus. Afferunt vero" (the two last named) "aliâ insuper rationem, 'ὅτι βίον ἄριστον εἶλον,' vel 'ὅτι πλείονα εὐλάβειαν ἐπεδείκνυντο.'" Suicer, Thes. sub voc. 'Απαρχή. And Fell (ad loc.) interprets St. Clement in the former way. So also Marshall, Penit. Discipl., c. iv. § 6. p. 174. Oxf. 1844.



a mistake more suitable to the prejudice which he had undertaken to maintain, than to the rest of his learning. For who knoweth not, that first-fruits are the best, the flower, the cream, of the whole? And if no man that dared not to profess Christianity, no man that had been put to penance for failing, having professed it, is to be of the clergy, you see why they are called the "first-fruits" of Christians.

§ 16. In the mean time, if the Church "judge not those that are without," doth it "not judge those that are within," according to St. Paul? Shew me any thing that ever was called a Church;—that is, shew me the time when, and the place where, Christianity was ever settled, and exercised according to order and rule;—where those that had received baptism, were not under a discipline of penance, failing of that which they had undertaken by it. What is reformation in the Church, and what is not, is the subject of this present dispute; therefore I cannot here grant, that which some of the reformation may have done, to be well done. Otherwise, I am secure, no man will choke me with naming a Church, that had no discipline of penance. But that so it was, I refer myself to that which I have said in the first Book<sup>a</sup>. I demand here, what is the ground and reason, that so it must be. For supposing the keys of God's kingdom exercised in the first place, in limiting the terms upon which baptism is granted, not in ministering of it; of necessity it followeth, that, in the second place, it be seen and exercised in limiting the terms, upon which those that have failed of that which they undertook at their baptism, may be restored to the visible communion of the Church; upon presumption, that they are restored to the invisible communion of those promises which the Gospel tendereth. Not supposing this, there is no reason why it should signify any more than a scene acted upon a stage; as it is taken to signify by those who understand not this.

§ 17. Lastly, I will mention here the express doctrine of the Church of England, in the beginning of the Catechism, declaring three things to have been undertaken in behalf of him that is baptized;—that he shall "forsake the devil and all his works, the pomp and vanities of this world, and the

Setting aside the Reformation, no Church that had not penance.<sup>2</sup>  
[1 Cor. v. 12.]

The doctrine of the Church of England evident in this case.

<sup>a</sup> Added in margin in MS.

<sup>a</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ix. § 11. sq.

**BOOK**  
**II.**

evil desires of the flesh," and not to be seduced by them, either from believing the faith of Christ, or from keeping God's commandments. And again, in the admonition to the sureties after baptism;—"You must remember, that it is your parts and duties, to see that these infants be taught, so soon as they shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession, they have made by you." For, all that come to Christianity believing what promises they get right to by it, and being admitted to it upon those terms, there can remain no question, upon what terms they attain the said promises. Nor can or ought any doctrine of that Church, to what purpose soever cautioned, be interpreted to the prejudice of that, wherein the salvation of all consisteth. But, further, in the introduction to the Office of Baptism:—"Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, 'None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,' I beseech you to call upon God, . . that these children may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made lively members of the same:"—proceeding to pray, "that they, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive remission of their sins by" their "spiritual regeneration." In the exhortation after the Gospel;—"Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will likewise favourably receive these present infants, that He will embrace them with the arms of His mercy, that He will give unto them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting kingdom." Again;—"Ye have heard also, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in His Gospel, to grant all these things that ye have prayed for." And after the sacrament;—"Seeing now, that these children be regenerate and grafted in the body of Christ's congregation." And again;—"We yield Thee hearty thanks, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy congregation." All this can leave no doubt of the communion of the Church of England with the whole Church in this point, so nearly concerning the salvation of all Christians.

## CHAPTER V.

THE PREACHING OF OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES EVIDENCETH, THAT SOME ACT OF MAN'S FREE CHOICE IS THE CONDITION WHICH IT REQUIRETH. THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT INFERRETH THE SAME. SO DO THE ERRORS OF SOCINIANS AND ANTINOMIANS CONCERNING THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM. OBJECTIONS DEFERRED.

THE whole tenor of the Scripture would afford matter of The argument to enforce this consequence; but it shall be preaching enough, to have thus far pointed out the ground, upon which of our Lord and His Apostles evidenceth, the meaning of the rest is to proceed. The reasons of this position, from the principles of Christianity, can be no other, than those which have been touched upon occasion of treating the passages of Scripture hitherto alleged. Yet, to make the consequence still more evident, I will here repeat, first, the consideration of God's sending our Lord Christ; to shew the world sufficient motives why they should embrace 24 His Gospel, as well as to teach them what it is, and wherein it consisteth. I will not here insist upon any supposition of the clear sufficiency of the Scriptures, or the necessity of tradition besides the Scriptures. But I will appeal to the common sense of all men, to judge, whether it be within the compass of reason, that our Lord Christ should come to preach, and to exhort men to acknowledge Him to be come from God and to take up His Cross; should shew them reasons to believe, that all which He preached is true, that so they might be persuaded willingly to follow Him; should give certain proofs of His rising again from death, to enforce the same; if men have no will, no choice, no freedom to do what He requires them or not to do it: whether, in other things, they have it or not. The same [is] to be said of His Apostles and disciples; who were strange creatures, to expose their lives for a warrant of the truth of what they said, if they had not willingly and freely embraced that profession themselves, which they pretended to induce the world with the like freedom of choice to embrace.

§ 2. Thus far then we are assured by common sense, that



BOOK  
II.

the condition required by the covenant of grace, on our part, must be some act of man's free choice; the doing whereof, at God's demand, must qualify us for those promises which it tenders. But this is not all that may appear to common reason by the proceeding of our Lord and His Apostles. The preaching of the Gospel premises, for a supposition upon which it proceedeth, that mankind are become enemies unto God through sin, and subjects of His wrath: proposing thereupon the terms, upon which they may be reconciled to God, and entitled presently to, and in due time possessed of, everlasting happiness. Suppose these terms purchased by the satisfaction of Christ, though not granting it (because all that call themselves Christians in the West do not); is it possible to imagine, that they who declare all mankind to be God's enemies for sin, should have commission to declare them heirs of His kingdom, not supposing them turned from sin to that righteousness, which shall be as universally according to God's will, as their sin is against it? As, on the contrary, supposing this, do you not suppose them qualified for God's promises, as fitly as men overtaken in sin can be? And is not this that which baptism supposeth, when St. Peter saith, Acts ii. 38, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins?"

[The baptism of Christ presupposeth repentance.]

§ 3. The baptism of John indeed was "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins:" Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3. But our Saviour's theme, as well as John Baptist's, when they began to preach, was, "Repent and believe the Gospel;" or, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand:" Mark i. 15; Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17. Therefore the baptism of Christ, as well as the baptism of John, presupposeth repentance. Only the promise of the Holy Ghost is proper to the baptism of Christ; because that remission of sins which John's baptism gave, presupposed not the covenant of grace enacted and published. And therefore it is no marvel, that the baptism of John is called "the baptism of water," when our Lord saith, Acts i. 5, "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost before many days." For it will not follow any more, that therefore the baptism of water is not Christ's baptism;

than it will follow, the baptism of John was not the baptism of repentance to remission of sins, because Christ's baptism was so, and because it had the promise of the Holy Ghost, which John's had not. CHAP. V.

§ 4. It is then to be considered, that the repentance of him that hath been qualified for the Gospel-promises, may be only conversion from some particular sin, supposing one sin of that weight as to void that title. But the repentance of him that is wholly enemy to God, such as the Gospel declareth Jews and Gentiles to be (as you find by St. Paul in the beginning of his Epistle to the Romans), necessarily signifieth conversion from all sin to all righteousness. The repentance therefore of him, who, finding himself overtaken in sin, hath recourse to Christianity for the cure of it, being necessarily a motion from all sin, the term wherein it resteth, being Christianity, is necessarily a resolution of all righteousness for the future. Which is all that my position demandeth. Only this, that whereas the profession of this resolution is also required, therefore it be not thought sufficient to profess for Christianity that which every man that readeth and believeth the Scriptures may take to be Christianity; but that which the Church (being trusted with the maintenance of that rule, the profession whereof is required to salvation by the Gospel) hath always required to be professed of them, who are baptized into the Church.

§ 5. And that the condition without this particular is not complete, may further appear, by assuming for granted that which hath here been proved by the premises; wherein I have demonstrated, that the first covenant which God by Moses made with the children of Israel, was, and was intended by God to be, the figure of the second covenant, which by our Lord Christ He hath established for all that will embrace it by undertaking Christianity: the correspondence between them consisting in this;—that as God, by the first, tendered them the happiness of the land of promise, upon condition of governing themselves according to the law which He gave them by Moses, so, by the second, He tenders everlasting happiness in the world to come to all those, that shall undertake to profess the faith of Christ and live according to that which He hath taught. Which being

The correspondence between the Old and New Testament in-ferreth the same.



BOOK  
II.

no more questionable, than it can be questioned by those who profess themselves Christians, whether or no the New Testament was intended and designed by the Old, whether Moses writ of Christ or not, whether Judaism was to make way or to give place to Christianity or not; and seeing it can no more be questioned, whether or no the Jews were to take upon them the law of God as their king, for the condition upon which they were to expect the land of promise: it is plain, there wants nothing that can be required duly to infer, that the condition, the undertaking whereof entitles Christians to life everlasting, is the profession of Christianity; and the performance thereof, that which is rewarded by the performance of all the promises which the Gospel tenders, as the performance of the Law was that, which secured the Israelites in the possession of the land of promise against their enemies round about. Now we know, that when the covenant of God with Abraham for the land of promise came to be limited, as to the condition required by God, to the law of Moses, that circumcision which God had required of all Abraham's seed, became a condition limiting the same to Israelites; the want whereof, at eight days old, was a forfeiture of that promise. For the waters of the Red Sea, which saved them and drowned the Egyptians, the cloud that overshadowed them, the manna which they eat, and the waters of the rock which they drank, though (according to St. Paul) sacraments answerable to the sacraments of the Church, were so but for the time of their travel through the wilderness. If, therefore, by virtue of these, the Israelites were entitled to the land of promise (which of circumcision is evident), then must the sacrament of baptism be necessarily requisite to the right of a Christian in the heavenly inheritance. This is the first reason, drawn from that which seems most evident in Christianity, and that which I have been able to infer and to premise from the same.

So do the errors of Socinians and Antinomians concerning the necessity of baptism: [resting upon

§ 6. But I will add another reason, though it seems to be of the same nature with these that go afore; which comes from the necessity of baptism. How much soever the licentiousness of this time may have debauched this wretched people from the Christianity which they were dedicated to by the Church of England, no pretence of Socinians, or



Antinomians, hath yet prevailed, to make them believe that it is not necessary for men to be christened, that intend to be Christians. There hath been indeed, among the fruits of this blessed reformation, a pamphlet seen under the title of *The Doctrine of Baptisms*<sup>b</sup>; the intent whereof is by a studied discourse to prove, that it was never the intent of our Lord and His Apostles that the baptism of water should be used to make men Christians with; being a legal rite, used by John the Baptist, to continue so long as the use of Moses' law was tolerated after the publishing of the Gospel, but to cease therewithal, when the baptism of the Spirit, which is the baptism of Christ, had succeeded the same. This 26 pamphlet [is] attributed to the master of a college in one of the Universities. How that University will wash their hands of acknowledging, as master of a college, one who cannot pass for a Christian among Christians, supposing him the author of this book, is not for this place to enquire. This is visible, that this opinion proceeds upon the common presumption of Antinomians, Enthusiasts, Quakers, and the like, that they have the Holy Ghost; though they presuppose not in themselves the profession of that true Christianity which the Catholic Church teacheth, and whether baptized or not: whether supposing themselves predestinate to life from everlasting upon the dictate of the same Spirit, or justified by that faith, which consisteth in revealing to them their predestination from everlasting: always supposing they have the Spirit in consideration of the merits and satisfaction of Christ, without supposing the truth of that Christianity which they profess, as a condition required by God in them [to] whom He gives His Spirit. But the opinion of the Socinians (having in detestation this unchristian as well as unreasonable principle) acknowledgeth the gift of the Holy

<sup>b</sup> Βαπτισμῶν Διδαχὴ, or, The Doctrine of Baptisms, &c. 4to. Lond. 1648. The author was William Dell, Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.—See Right of the Church, c. i. § 17. note p; Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 24; and below, Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vi.—See also Saltmarsh, Smoke in the Temple (4to. Lond. 1646), p. 13; "Matt. 28. 18, and Mark 16, &c., are rather and far more probably to be expounded of

the Spirit's baptism or the baptism of the Holy Ghost." And p. 14; "Neither can Christ's institution of water as His own baptism, in His own Person, be made appear out of all the N. T.; nor can the Apostles' practice by water yet be fetched from such a particular institution, unless from John's." And p. 15; "None ought to give the baptism now, because there is none can give the Holy Ghost with it."

BOOK  
II.

Ghost to be granted by God to those, who, believing our Lord Jesus to be the Christ, resolve to live according to all that He hath taught; but denieth any consideration of the merits and satisfaction of Christ, either in His sending the Gospel, or in His giving the Holy Ghost to enable a man to perform that which it requireth: only acknowledging the free grace of God in sending those terms of reconciliation which the Gospel importeth, and the free choice of man in accepting or refusing the same; but, upon the accepting or refusing of them, concluding the promises of the Gospel to be necessarily due: and, therefore, presuming, that it is altogether unreasonable to make them still to depend upon an outward ceremony of baptism by water, the consideration upon which they are tendered being already performed. And, therefore, construing the proceeding of the Apostles, and the Scriptures wherein they are mentioned, upon such presumptions as these, they conclude the reason and intent of the baptism which they gave, according to the commission of our Lord, to be particular to the condition of those, who, being Jews or Gentiles before, were thereby to acknowledge their uncleanness in that estate and to profess a contrary course for the future. So that, the reason ceasing why they did baptize, the obligation also of their baptism must necessarily cease<sup>c</sup>.

[Yet the way plain-  
ed for  
them by  
the denial  
of the  
Church  
Catholic  
common to  
both.]

§ 7. But in this great distance between the grounds upon which these extreme opinions infer the indifference of baptism, it is easy to observe something common to both: namely, that neither of them acknowledgeth any Catholic Church, or any presumption of the visible unity thereof, limiting that part of the doctrine taught by the Scriptures, which it is

<sup>c</sup> "Non omnes hac ceremonia devinctos esse inde constat, quod baptismus iste non nisi symbolum fuit, quo homines qui eum suscipiebant, publice solenniterque Christi nomen profitebantur. Quæ quidem res nonnisi in illos conveniebat, qui vel nullam vel certe aliam præter Christianam religionem coluerant; quales illa fuerunt, qui vel ex Judaica vel Ethnica natione oriundi, Christo sese dicarunt. Qui enim ab ineunte ætate Christi nomen quacumque tandem ratione professi erant, illis nequaquam opus fuit, idem per aquæ baptismum publice ac so-

lenniter facere: cum satis jam constaret eos Christiana religione imbutos esse." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. VI. c. xiv. p. 672.—"Ad extremum, quod Spiritus Sancti munus baptismis aquæ alligatum sit, ita ut absque eo contingere nemini queat, falsissimum est. Tametsi enim ut plurimum baptismum consequatur; non tamen ut effectus causam suam necessariam aut propriam." Id., *ibid.*, p. 678. And see above, c. i. § 7. note r; and below, § 10. note g: and Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 24. note m.



necessary to the salvation of all Christians that they profess, as received from hand to hand by the Churches of the Apostles' founding, to be exacted of them whom they baptize into themselves. For, this being set aside, why should not enthusiasts persuade themselves, that they have the Spirit of God, and a title to all the promises of the Gospel depending upon it, by Christ; if the Socinians can persuade themselves, that they may have it by the mere act of their free will, accepting the tender of the Gospel, by believing that our Lord is the Christ, and resolving to live as He hath taught, without any consideration of His merits and sufferings: both being persuaded, that, for their salvation, they are to make what they can of the Scriptures, without any regard to the Church for securing the intent and meaning of it. What shall hinder them indeed, supposing the way plained to them both, by admitting the necessity of baptism to be such that all the effects and consequences thereof may be thought to be had and obtained before and without it? Certainly the waving of those grounds, upon which the necessity of baptism may appear to be consistent with the undoubted efficacy of that Christianity which the heart only feeleth, is the breach that hath made a gap for these heresies to enter into God's Church. For if no man can be thought to have right to be baptized, that hath not true and living faith, which true and living faith alone qualifies any man for remission of sins and salvation (whether it consist in believing, that our Lord Jesus  
27 is the Christ,—because he who believes that, is obliged to live as He teacheth,—and the Scriptures, according to the Socinians; or in believing, that we are predestinate to life in regard of our Lord Christ dying for us, according to the Enthusiasts); what remaineth for baptism to procure, that is not assured already before a man be baptized?

§ 8. And, therefore, I conceive I demand nothing but reason. For all the gain that I demand from all this is no more, but that it be freely acknowledged, that justification by faith alone, and that faith which alone justifieth, be not so understood as to make the promises of the Gospel due before baptism; to which the Scripture, interpreted by the consent and practice of the whole Church, testifieth that baptism concurrereth. A thing which can by no means be



BOOK  
II.

obtained, but by placing that faith which alone justifieth, as well in the outward act of professing, as in the inward act of believing: this profession containing an express promise or vow to God, whereby we undertake to live as those who believe the Gospel of Christ are by God's law to live; and that promise or vow to be celebrated and solemnized by the sacrament of baptism, appointed by our Lord Christ to that purpose. For, seeing the professing of Christianity, and not the believing of it, is that which brings upon the Church that persecution, which the cross of Christ (the mark of a disciple) signifies; neither can it be reasonable, that God should allow the promises of the Gospel to any quality that includeth it not, nor unreasonable, that He should make them depend upon it. And seeing it is not the profession of any thing that a man may call Christianity (though, perhaps, grounded upon an imagination that he hath learned it from the Scriptures), which God accepteth (whatsoever a man may suffer for the maintenance and affirmation of it), but of that which Himself sent our Lord Christ to preach; it is no marvel, if God, Who esteemeth nothing but for that affection of the heart wherewith it is done, should notwithstanding accept no disposition of the heart towards the profession of Christianity, but that which is executed and solemnized by such an outward ceremony as Himself hath limited His disciples and their successors to celebrate it with. For, supposing that God hath founded the unity of His Church upon supposition of professing that Christianity which He gave His Apostles commission to preach, consisting in the visible communion of those offices which God is served with by Christians, it will be evident, why God, Who esteemeth the heart alone, hath not allowed the promises of His Gospel to any but those who profess Christianity by being admitted to baptism by the Church; because, as it is not any belief or resolution that may be called Christianity, but that which the Church hath received from the Lord and His Apostles, that qualifies a man for those promises which God tenders by the covenant of grace, so it is not the profession of any belief or resolution, that qualifies a man for communion with the Church by baptism, but of that which the Church professeth to have received from our Lord and His Apostles.

And this is the true ground of the foundation of the Church, CHAP.  
V. and the society thereof, whereof so much hath been said<sup>d</sup>: to wit, that God, giving His Gospel for the salvation of mankind, did think fit to trust the guard and exercise of it to men once instructed by those, to whom at the first He had given immediate commission to publish and establish Christianity; rather than leave them to expect at His hands every day new revelations and miracles, for introducing that, which had once been sufficiently declared. And, also, rather than leave every man to his own head, to make what he can of the Scriptures, and think he hath salvation by living according to it. For, supposing that Christianity which is delivered by the Scriptures once subject to be misunderstood and corrupted (of which we have but too much experience), an effectual course to preserve it will be, to found a corporation or society of the Church; the members whereof, each in his own rank, should remain intrusted by God (but by the means of their predecessors, from whom they received Christianity) to preserve both the profession of Christian truth and the exercise of God's service inviolable.

- 28 § 9. Nor is it effectual to say, that the unity of the Church may fail, being divided by heresies and schisms; insomuch that that baptism which is visibly valid and good, shall be void of that invisible effect which it pretendeth<sup>e</sup>. For it is not requisite, that God should provide such means of salvation as may be undefeasible. It is enough, that they are reasonable. He that is baptized into a profession destructive to that which all Christians are bound upon their salvation to believe, perishes for want of faith; setting aside the unity of the Church, which his heresy violates over and above. But if the unity of the Church be of such advantage to the maintenance of our common Christianity, as it was before the dissolving of it; it is no marvel, if the baptism of schismatics (though valid and good for the visible form) become void of effect to them, who by receiving it make themselves parties to the breach of the unity of the Church. We agree, that the power of the Church of Rome is the occasion of many abuses in the Church. What they are, it is [not] my

[Existence  
of here-  
sies and  
schisms no  
objection.]

<sup>d</sup> Above, Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., cc. vi. sq.

<sup>e</sup> See *ibid.*, c. vii., and c. x. § 1. and 43.



BOOK  
II.

present business to enquire. He that bounds the interpretation of the Scriptures within the sense of the Catholic Church, shall not transgress the law of God's truth in that enquiry. He that accepts the bounds of his own fancy instead of them, is it not just with God, if he die? If our common Christianity, and the maintenance thereof, depend so much upon the unity of the Church, is it not reason, that the benefit of it should depend upon the same? He who, having attained the true faith, and according to the same seeking the unity of the Church, faileth of it without any fault of his own (if he who so seeketh it can be supposed to fail of it), hath the difficulty of overcoming his own ignorance to plead for his excuse. But for them, who have the consent of all Christians from the beginning to oblige them to undertake the profession of Christianity by baptism, but out of hatred to the present Church and the abuses of it neglect baptism, upon presumption that they have the Holy Ghost without it, or that the reason why the Apostles baptized is now ceased; I say, that for them, I suppose, there remains no just plea; seeing that, by the unity of the Catholic Church, they ought to have been guided in judging what is of the abuse of the present Church and what is not.

§ 10. And thus that consideration, which some seem to be (not without cause) scandalized at<sup>f</sup> (when these effects of Christianity, the power whereof must necessarily consist in an unfeigned heart, are made to depend upon an outward ceremony of baptism which the Church gives), is utterly voided; by that reason which the Apostle insinuates when he says, that "baptism saves us, not the laying down of the filth of the flesh, but that profession to God, which is made with a good and a sincere conscience." Whereas those, that distinguish that faith which alone justifieth from the profession thereof which baptism executeth, oblige themselves to make baptism a ceremony, not whereon the promises of the Gospel depend, but to signify that they are had and

[1 Pet. iii.  
21.]

<sup>f</sup> For instance, Baxter, Plain Scripture Proof of Infants' Church Membership and Baptism, Append. p. 309. Lond. 4th. edit. 1656: "Can anything be more contrary to Scripture than that believers in sincerity are damned? .. and who knows not that true believers

may be unbaptized?" and p. 310, speaking of those who delayed their baptism in the primitive Church, as "Constantine, Austin, &c." and of the Anabaptists, "have none of them grace till baptized?"—For the Socinians, see Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. vi. c. xiv. p. 669.



obtained without it<sup>g</sup>. But to whom signify? Not to God, CHAP.  
V. Who giveth them. Not to him that has them, and by his faith knows he has them. Not to the Church; which can never be certified that he hath them indeed, and demands only to be certified that he wants nothing requisite to presume him to be such. So that, baptism being required only to presume that a man is a Christian, and that presumption being legally had by any act the Church (or any that call themselves the Church) can require, as well as by being baptized (if that be all), there is no reason to be given the Socinians, why baptism should be necessary to the salvation of Christians, and therefore why it should not be in their power to use it or not to use it. And truly I do much marvel to see the Socinians, that have very well seen the truth concerning the twofold meaning of the Law, literal and spiritual (and the promise of the land of Canaan tied to the carnal observation thereof, as that of everlasting life to the spiritual obedience of it<sup>h</sup>),—I say, I do marvel to see, that in conse-

<sup>g</sup> "Crediderim tamen (baptismum) . . . propter eos," &c., "retinendum esse; . . . cum aquæ baptismus, in Jesu Christi videlicet Nomine ministratus, nihil aliud sit quam adumbratio remissionis peccatorum in Nomine Christi, Ejusque Nominis aperta professio, atque in Ipsius religionem initiatio quædam; id est, per eum nihil revera datur; sed tantummodo eorum, quæ vel jam data esse vel datum iri certissimum est, externa quædam agnitio significetur." Socin., De Eccles., Cap. de Bapt.; Op., tom. i. p. 351. a.—"Nihil aliud aquæ baptismi peccata ablui significare dicendum est, quam per baptismum peccata jam deleta esse declarari et publice quodam modo obsignari. Quamobrem, . . . non vere per baptismum istum peccata ipsa deleri, . . . continuo sequetur, sed tantummodo deleta esse palam ostendi et quasi consignari." Id., De Bapt. Aquæ, c. vii.; ibid., p. 724. b.—"Baptisme bryngeth not grace, but doth testifie unto the congregation that he which is baptised had such grace given hym before." It "is a sacrament, that is, a signe of an holy thyng, even a token of the grace and free mercy whiche was before geuen hym." Frith, Declaration of Baptisme, Works, p. 92. fol. Lond. 1573. And similarly Tindal and Hooper, as quoted (with Frith) by Maskell, Holy Baptism, pp. 370—372. Compare also Calvin, Instit.,

lib. iv. c. xv. § 22; Op., tom. ix. p. 354: "Accedit postea sacramentum sigilli instar, non quod efficaciam Dei promissioni quasi per se invalidæ conferat, sed eam duntaxat nobis confirmet: unde sequitur, non ideo baptizari fidelium liberos ut filii Dei tunc primum fiant qui ante alieni fuerint ab Ecclesia, sed solenni potius signo ideo recipi in Ecclesiam, quia promissionis beneficio jam ante ad Christi Corpus pertinebant." And so also Cartwright, Confut. of Rhemists' Transl. on Matt. iii. 11: "Wee bring not our children to baptisme, to the end that they should thereby have remission of sinnes; but because we are by the promise induced to believe, that as being the elect of God they have already received it." And the Scotch Confession of Faith, c. xxviii. § 6, restricting the grace of Baptism to "such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will." And Baxter at length, as quoted in note f.

<sup>h</sup> "Animadvertendum est enim, duplicem esse legis moralis, de qua potissimum disputatur, sensum: alterum perfectiorem, quem non raro ipsa legis verba per se sumta postulare videntur, . . . alterum imperfectiorem, accommodatum statui populi Judaici adhuc rudis et carnalis; qui quidem inserviebat partim exercendo illi populo in cultus

BOOK  
II.

quence hereunto they should not infer, that God hath appointed a spiritual people of the Christian Church, answerable to Israel according to the flesh; and that His spiritual promises should depend upon the visible initiation of every Christian into the body of that people (as the right of His temporal promises depended upon their initiation into the body of carnal Israelites), not according to birth but according to promise. Only, when I consider on the other side, that without regard to the article of the Catholic Church, which Christians make a part of their creed, they rest in such a communion as their private persuasion of the sense of the Scriptures shall be of force to produce; I do not marvel to see them not own the consequence of their own principles, when they see it not stand with other prejudices, which they have embraced.

Objections  
deferred.

§ 11. I know there are two things will be objected here: the one is a mere prejudice, that by maintaining of free will (by maintaining the covenant of grace to consist in an act of it) we shall incur the heresy of Pelagius; the other, that if the condition of the covenant of grace be an express profession, vow, and promise, to live, as well as to believe, according to what Christ hath taught, and that without the use of reason no such promise can be of force or take place, then infants cannot be baptized, who cannot make, or be tied to, any such promise. To these I say no more but this, that it is one thing to answer arguments and to give grounds of a contrary truth, another thing to object difficulties; which even the truth is not clear of; especially that which comes by revelation from without, as Christianity doth: because to

Divini rudimentis, partim civili honestati et tranquillitati publicæ, atque adeo terrenæ felicitati, quam Deus populo promiserat, conservandæ. Hoc posteriori modo legem servare et poterat et debebat, quisquis promissis illis terrenis, quæ antea recensuimus, potiri cupiebat. . . Quod ad priorem legis sensum attinet, qui perfectior est, et perpetuam omnibusque numeris absolutam mandatorum divinorum observationem postulat; ad eum respicit Paulus, cum de operibus legis disserit, et ex iis homines justificari negat. Etsi enim eo quoque pacto legem Dei servare, non sit prorsus naturaque sua impossibile, . . tamen adeo id est difficile, ut nec de

quoquam in sacris litteris legatur, nec credibile sit quemquam præter Christum exstitisse, qui eo modo legem Dei impleverit." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. ii. c. 21. pp. 33, 34.—And see above, Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., cc. xii, xiii. Compare Bp. Bull's statement: "Quæ verba" (scil. "in conspectu Dei," Rom. iii. 20) "signanter et emphatice addita sunt, quia concedenda erat Legi suæ quædam δικαιοσύνη, sed apud homines, et quæ ad temporalem tantum felicitatem proderat, non ad regnum cælorum obtinendum." Harm. Apost., *Diss. Post.*, c. viii. § 14; *Works*, vol. iii. p. 144.



the verifying of revealed truth it is not necessary, that all things should be alike clearly revealed that are necessary to the clearing of all objections; the obligation of sticking to that which is revealed taking place no less, though something belonging to the clearing of it be not so clearly expressed. And, generally, that which is evident, is never the less evident, because there is something else evident, the evidence whereof I cannot reconcile with it. But this I say, not as though I meant to dismiss these difficulties, without that which I conceive ought to satisfy; but because I have learned of Aristotle, that it is the fashion of the unlearned, to demand at once both the grounds of the truth and the clearing of difficulties<sup>1</sup>. A thing which might be done here, but so that another place would require it to be done again, and not without balking the order which I intend. My design will bring me in due time to speak with the Pelagians first<sup>2</sup>, and afterwards with the Anabaptists<sup>3</sup>. To those points I will remit the answer to these objections. Only, for the present, to the former of these doubts I would say this: that all that hath been said hitherto, concerns only that disposition, which he that will come to salvation by Christianity must be formally qualified with, as the condition which the covenant of grace requireth: all which being supposed, it may and doth still remain questionable, how and by what means, in the nature of an effective cause, a man becomes qualified with the disposition so required; to wit, whether by the mere force of free will, or by the help of God's grace: and, that being resolved, upon what consideration, in the nature of a meritorious cause, those helps of God's grace are furnished; to wit, whether by the free grace of God, or in consideration of the merits and satisfaction of Christ, provided by God's free grace, as the reason for which, and the measure by which, the helps of His grace are dispensed. To the latter of them I would only say here; that I conceive<sup>4</sup> I have here maintained that reason for the necessity of baptism to the salvation of all Christians, upon which the necessity of the

<sup>1</sup> Aristot., Eth. Eudem., I. vi. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Below, c. x.: and Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vii.

<sup>3</sup> "For if baptism be absolutely necessary to salvation, it is also necessary

that infants should be baptized; lest they should die without baptism, if it was deferred till they came to years of discretion."—Added in margin in MS.



BOOK II. baptism of infants is to be tied<sup>1</sup>. Which is to say, in plain English; that I have, by the premises, re-established that ground for the necessity of baptism in general, the unsettling whereof was the only occasion to make the necessity of baptizing infants become questionable.

## CHAPTER VI.

30

JUSTIFYING FAITH SOMETIMES CONSISTS IN BELIEVING THE TRUTH; SOMETIMES, IN TRUST IN GOD GROUNDED UPON THE TRUTH; SOMETIMES, IN CHRISTIANITY, THAT IS, IN EMBRACING AND PROFESSING IT. AND THAT IN THE FATHERS AS WELL AS IN THE SCRIPTURES. OF THE INFORMED AND FORMED FAITH OF THE SCHOOLS.

Justifying faith sometimes consists in believing the truth.

Now, for those Scriptures wherein the nature of justifying faith is described by those effects which the promises of the Gospel tender, I must here observe that which all observe, that faith is many times made by the Scriptures to consist in believing the truth of Christ's message which He came to preach; otherwhiles, nevertheless, in a grounded trust and confidence in the goodness of God declared through Christ. For what is more manifest than that of St. Paul, Rom. x. 9; "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe with thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Where, first, that which the heart believeth is the rising of Christ from the dead (signifying by one article the rest of the faith); then, that which the mouth professeth, is nothing but the same truth. Therefore neither the inward nor the outward act of faith reacheth any further, than the acknowledgment of the said truth. So the Apostle, 1 John v. 1, 5, 10: "Every one that believeth that Jesus is the Messias, is begotten of God: . . who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? . . he that believeth in the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he believeth not the witness which God beareth of His Son." Where it is plain, that no difference is made

<sup>1</sup> "tried." MS.

between 'believing God' and 'believing in the Son of God'; CHAP. VI.  
 and 'πιστεύειν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,' is no more than  
 'to believe God's witness.' Matt. ix. 28, [29,] Jesus saith  
 to the blind, "Believe you that I am able to do this? they  
 say unto Him, Yea, Lord: then touched He their eyes, say-  
 ing, According to your faith be it unto you:"—that faith,  
 which consisted in believing that He was able to do it. So  
 of John the Baptist, our Lord, Matt. xxi. 32: "John came  
 to you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not,  
 but the publicans and harlots believed him; which you see-  
 ing, repented not afterwards that ye might believe him."  
 And sure they obtained the grace of Christ, that believed  
 John the Baptist. Our Lord to the father of the lunatic,  
 Mark ix. 23, 24: "If thou canst believe, all things are pos-  
 sible to him that believeth; and straight the father of the  
 child crying out said, . . . Lord, I believe, help my unbelief:"  
 —"if thou canst believe" that I am able to do this, as afore.  
 Mark xi. 23, 24: "He that shall say to this mountain, Be  
 thou removed and cast into the sea, and doubt not in his  
 heart, but believe, that what he sayeth cometh to pass, it  
 shall come to pass to him as he sayeth; therefore I say unto  
 you, all things that ye ask by prayer believe that ye shall  
 receive, and they shall come to pass to you."—John v. 24;  
 "He that heareth Me and believeth Him that sent Me, <sup>["Heareth  
 My word."]</sup> hath eternal life, and cometh not into condemnation, but is  
 passed from death to life."—xx. 31; "These things are writ-  
 ten, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son  
 of God, and that believing ye may have life through His  
 Name."—Acts viii. 37: "Philip said to the eunuch, If thou  
 believest with all thy heart, thou mayest be baptized; he  
 answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of  
 God." Upon which faith he is baptized. Rom. iv. 3;  
 "Abraham believed God" (saying to him, 'Thy seed shall  
 be as the stars of heaven,' Gen. xv. 5), "and it was imputed  
 to him for righteousness."

§ 2. On the other side, it is no rare thing to find faith de- Sometimes  
 scribed by trust and confidence in God, and the effects of in trust  
 saving faith ascribed to it: as in the description of the Apo- in God  
 stle, Heb. xi. 1, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped grounded  
 for, the evidence of things not seen." That which he calls upon the  
 "ὑπόστασιν τῶν ἐλπιζομένων," is that which the Hebrew truth.



BOOK  
II.

expresseth by תוֹחֶלֶת or תְּקוּהָ<sup>m</sup>; both which are sometimes translated in the Greek of the Old Testament “*ὑπόστασις*,” signifying confidence: as the resolution of Horatius Cocles,<sup>31</sup> not giving way to the enemy, is called by Polybius “*ὑπόστασις*”; and in Livy, “*subsistere hostem*” is to stand the enemy. So Heb. iii. 14, “*ἀρχὴ ὑποστάσεως*” is the “first confidence” of Christians; and 2 Cor. ix. 4, “*ὑπόστασις καυχήσεως*,” “confidence in boasting.” So Rom. iii. 25; “Whom God hath proposed as a propitiatory through faith in His blood.” The propitiatory was set before the Israelites to assure them of God’s help, according to the Law: so is Christ, saith the Apostle, to them that have recourse to Him with confidence, alleging for themselves His blood shed for us. So James i. 6, 7: “But let him ask in faith nothing doubting: for he that doubteth, is like the sea waves tossed and stirred with the winds; let not such a man think that he shall obtain anything of God.” Where the efficacy of prayer is ascribed to an assured confidence of obtaining that which is desired: and therefore that belief, which (according to the words of our Lord, Mark xi. 23, 24) seemeth properly to consist in this assurance, obtains all prayers. And, not supposing St. Paul to speak of the common faith of all Christians, when he saith, 1 Cor. xiii. 2, “If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains,” yet, as he insinuates that this is done by that particular assurance and confidence, which that grace giveth him that hath it, so must the conquest of the world by the common faith of Christians be ascribed to that assurance and confidence, with which all Christians expect God’s promises. And truly, through the manifold indifference of signification, which words will afford them that will use them to their purpose, it cannot be denied, that ‘to believe God,’ and ‘to believe in God’ is sometimes all a thing. Yet it is very hard to believe, that they are intended by the

<sup>m</sup> “תוֹחֶלֶת (a rad. תִּחַל) *expectatio*, *spes*; Ps. xxxix. 8, Prov. x. 23.” Gesen. in voc. In the first passage (Ps. xxxviii. 7.) the LXX render the word by *ὑπόστασις*.—“תְּקוּהָ. num. 2. *expectatio*, *spes* (a קָנָה *expectavit*) Ruth i. 12, Job. v. 16, vi. 8, Zach. ix. 12.” Gesen. in voc.: in the first of which passages the LXX. have *ὑπόστασις*.

<sup>n</sup> Polyb., Hist.; vi. 55; tom. ii. p.

571. ed. Schweigh.: “Οὐχ οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ δόξαν καταπεπληγμένων τῶν ὑπεναντίων.” —“Ἑπόστασις . . . 2) constantia (in bello tolerando, resistendo), fiducia, iv. 50. 10, . . vi. 55. 2.” Schweigh., Lexic. Polyb., in voc.

<sup>o</sup> Liv. ix. 31.—“E Græco ὑφίστασθαι.” Ernesti in Glossar. Liviano.

<sup>p</sup> “Yet there is so little or rather no difference in the Hebrew, that in the



Scripture to signify always the same thing; being so frequently and ordinarily used with a difference. For if we consider, that in very many texts of the Old Testament the nature of faith is expressed by **חסה** and **בטח** with the particle **ב**, by which speeches “trusting” and “confidence” in some body or some thing (particularly in God, when the speech is of religion), is signified, as well as by **האמין**, which signifies “believing in” God; it will be impossible to imagine, that all such expressions import no more than barely believing those things to be true, which God or man says: though sometimes “believing God” and “believing in God” may signify all one<sup>q</sup>. The Apostle, Heb. xi. 33—35, thus reckoneth the marvellous things, which through faith came to pass to the fathers of the Old Testament:—“Who by faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the force of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, recovered of infirmities, prevailed in war, put to flight armies of strangers, women received their dead

CHAP.  
VI.

first place where it is used, and that of the father of the faithful, even for the act of justifying faith, **והאמין ביהוה**, Gen. xv. 6, it is translated by the LXX **καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ Θεῷ**, not **εἰς Θεόν**, and that translation warranted by St. Paul, Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6, and St. James ii. 23.” Pearson (On the Creed, Art. 1. p. 31, note k. Oxf. 1833.): who cites also other passages.—“To believe with an addition of the preposition *in*, is a phrase or expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to God Himself, as always implying, besides a bare act of faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An observation, as I conceive, prevailing especially in the Latin Church, grounded principally upon the authority of St. Augustin. Whereas among the Greeks, in whose language the N. T. was penned, I perceive no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the Creed: and in the Hebrew language of the Old, . . it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification.” Id., ib., in text.—“Phrasis **πιστεύει εἰς τινά** apud Græcos Scriptores profanos nusquam (quod sciam) occurrit, sed est idiotismus linguæ Hebrææ . . . Observandum autem est, apud Hebræos duplicem esse phrasin, *credere alicui et credere in aliquem*; in quibus verborum potius discrimen est quam rerum. . . Constat Hebraice phrases *credere alicui, et credere in ali-*

*quem*, promiscue usurpari tam de Deo quam de creaturis. Imo, tantum abest ut phrasis, *Credere in Deum*, fiduciam justificatricem per se significet, ut aliquando fiduciam ne omnino quidem significet. . . Haud me fugit, Augustinum alicubi subtiliter (pro more suo) distinxisse hæc tria, *credere Deo, credere Deum, et credere in Deum*. Sed . . Augustino, *credere in Deum*, nihil aliud est quam *amare Deum*.” Bull, Exam. Cens., Resp. ad Anim. xiii. § 15; Works, vol. iv. pp. 156, 157.—See S. Aug., In Joh. Evang. Tract. xxix. § 6; Op., tom. iii. P. ii. p. 515. D; and from him P. Lombard, Sent. lib. iii. Dist. xxiii.—“Tametsi non desunt qui idem prorsus esse existiment *Credere Deo, et Credere in Deum*, sive in Deo; falli tamen omnino videntur isti.” Socin., De Christ. Serv., P. iv. c. 9; Op., tom. ii. p. 230. b.

<sup>q</sup> “**חסה** pr. *fugit* . . inde *fiduciam* reposuit in aliquo, maxime Deo sq. **ב**.” Gesen. in voc.—“**בטח**, *confians* est alicui, *spem et fiduciam* in aliquo collocavit. Sq. **ב** . . **על** . . **אל**.” Gesen. in voc.—“**האמין**, *fulcivit*, . . Hiph. **האמין** *inmixus*, est. . . Plerumque 2) *translate fidem habuit*,” (with **ב**) “3) *credidit*, absol. *Jen*. 7. 9, plerumque seq. **ל** pers. et rei.” Gesen. in voc.

BOOK  
II.

raised again, others were beaten to death, not expecting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." And can it be reasonable to impute these effects to the bare belief of God's power or goodness, or whatsoever else can be thought requisite for them then to believe; whenas that trust and confidence in God, which supposeth that belief, is both by the nature thereof nearer to these effects, and apt to dispose them to undergo those trials, under which they found such deliverances? For of them all we may say as the Apostle of Elias, James v. 17, 18: "Elias was a man subject to like passions with us; and he earnestly prayed that it might not rain, and it rained not upon the land for three years and six months; and again he prayed, and the heavens gave rain, and the earth put forth her fruit." The confidence which Elias had grounded upon God's presence with him, made him first pray for drought, and then for rain; which came to pass, according to his saying, 1 Kings xvii. 1, that "there should be neither dew nor rain for those years but according to his word." And so the trust, which the rest there mentioned had in God, to obtain so great things as the Apostle says befel them, that, rather than the belief of God's power and goodness, or whatsoever else they were to believe, challenges so great effects to be ascribed to it.

Sometimes in Christianity, that is, in embracing and professing it.

§ 3. I must now observe a third notion, which this word faith signifies: especially in the writings of the Apostles, from whence this difficulty is in the first place to be derived; which you shall find Heb. x. 39,—“We are not of apostasy to destruction, but of faith to the saving of the soul.” What<sup>32</sup> is opposite to falling from faith, but perseverance in it? Or what doth all this Epistle, but learn the Jews that were Christians, not to forsake Christianity for the persecutions raised against them by those of their kindred? So here faith is Christianity, as apostasy the renouncing of it. Then St. Paul, when he saith that his Apostleship was “for the obedience of faith in all nations” (Rom. i. 5), and (Rom. xvi. 26) that the Gospel is “made known to all nations for the obedience of faith,” must needs signify that submission, which those that render themselves Christians do undertake, for the performing of that condition, whereupon the Gospel tenders everlasting life: of which he saith again, Rom. iii. 27, that “boasting is not excluded by the law of works, but by



the law of faith." For every law being a condition upon which a man enjoys some benefit in some society whereof he is a part, the law of faith must needs be that condition, the undergoing whereof entitles all men to the common claim of all Christians; which is their Christianity. So, when St. Paul exhorteth them, Rom. xii. 3, 6, "to think of themselves unto sobriety, according as God hath divided to every one a measure of faith;" as again, if any man had the gift of prophecy, "according to the proportion of faith;" it is manifest, that his meaning in the latter text is, if any man had profited so far in Christianity, that God thereupon had bestowed on him the grace of prophesying. For though it is well known that God sometimes gave that grace to those whom He loved not to life, as Saul, and Balaam, and Caiaphas, and those who shall say once, "Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name?" Matt. vii. 22. (which notwithstanding, under Christianity, is limited to the profession thereof, as I shewed you in the beginning); yet it is as certain, that those whom God employeth to His people and Church upon those commissions that require such graces, those He useth to choose for their proficiency in true godliness: the prophets of the Old Testament being so ordinarily assumed out of those that had lived in the study of godliness under the discipline of the prophets their masters, that Amos (vii. 14.) alleges it as a strange thing that God had made him a prophet of an herdsman, and that therefore he could not but do his message; and, "Is Saul among the prophets?" became a riddle rather than a proverb, not to be resolved but by another question, "And who is the father of them?" that is, that God, the Father of all prophets, could give His graces where He pleased, without means, 1 Sam. x. 11, 12. And therefore at the election of St. Matthias to the office of an Apostle, to which this grace belonged, the disciples pray (Acts i. 24), "Thou Lord that knowest the hearts of all, shew whether of these Thou hast chosen:" shewing the Christianity of the heart to be the foundation of that choice. And when St. Paul exhorteth to think soberly of themselves according to "that measure of faith" which God had divided to every one, it is manifest that this measure of faith extends to all graces, the thought whereof may carry a man beyond the bounds of sobriety;

[Rom. xii.  
3, 6.]

BOOK  
II.

["Faith  
which  
worketh by  
love."  
Eng.  
Vers.]

that is, all wherein Christianity consisteth. So that the "measure" or "proportion of faith," is the measure and proportion of Christianity; which, being given by God, though seconded with graces which all had not, He forbids them to be puffed up with. Again, when the same Apostle hopeth, that the faith of the Corinthians, being increased, should be magnified abundantly through them by his preaching the Gospel to the parts beyond them (according to his own rule), 2 Cor. x. 15, 16, what is that increase of faith but the settling of them in their Christianity; which when it were done, he hoped by their means to find access to preach to their neighbours. I do confidently challenge to this signification that text of St. Paul, Gal. v. 6; "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith that is acted by love:" because I know, that no man that understands Greek can deny that "*ἐνεργουμένη*" is in this place passive; and because it cannot be understood without violence, how faith should be "acted by love," but when that profession which we make at our baptism is performed for no other motive but that of God and His love<sup>r</sup>. What is then that "work of the Thessalonians' faith" which St. Paul commendeth, 1 Thess. i. 3; which he prayeth God<sup>33</sup> "powerfully to fulfil," 2 Thess. ii. 11; but the doing of that which they undertook to do when they were made Christians? And what is the "ministry of the Philippians' faith," Philip. ii. 17, but the service which St. Paul did God in labouring to make them good Christians? And what is the faith in which he would have the Corinthians to stand, 1 Cor. xvi. 13? wherein he and Barnabas exhort the Churches to continue, Acts xiv. 22? The bare profession of Christianity, or the habituated resolution of living according to it? By which reason, whensoever the profession of Christianity is signified by the name of faith in the writings of the Apostles (in which

<sup>r</sup> "Δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, per charitatem efficax, seu potius ad effectum producta et consummata, Gal. v. 6. (participium enim ἐνεργουμένη ibi loci passive sumendum, sicut et alias fere semper in N. T., facile crediderim)." Bp. Bull, Harmon. Apostol., Diss. Prior, c. iv. § 5; Works, vol. iii. p. 51: who proves his assertion at length, both from Scripture and from Fathers, in the

Exam. Censuræ, Respons. ad Animadv. ii. § 3, 4; ibid., vol. iv. pp. 22—24. On the other hand, Cameron (ad loc., inter Crit. Sac., tom. vii. pp. 3361, 3362) argues, that the word is active; and Cappellus (ad loc., ibid., p. 3362), that it has a middle signification: and Schleusner (Lex. sub. voc. ἐνεργέω) translates the phrase, "fides quæ se benevolentia erga alios exerit."



sense it stands as frequently there as in any other), this habituated resolution is presupposed; because upon presumption thereof men are made Christians to the Church as well as to God. For no man is really and naturally a Christian to God until he be so legally to the Church; unless it be, when the effectual purpose of being so is prevented by that necessity which reasonably cannot be prevented. And hereupon it is, that though men believe the truth of Christianity before they are made Christians by being baptized, yet even in the Scriptures themselves believers and Christians are many times all one. 1 Tim. v. 8, 16: "If any man provide not for his own, and especially those of his household, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel; . . if any believer, he or she, have widows, let them support them, and let not the Church be charged."—vi. 2; "Those servants that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but serve them the rather because they are faithful and beloved."—Titus i. 6; "If any man be blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe, not blamed for riotousness or disobedience." Apoc. xvii. 14, "they that are with the Lamb," are such as are "called, and choice, and believers." And hereupon, when the Apostle saith, 3 John 5, "Ἀγαπήτε, πιστὸν ποιεῖς ὃ ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ξένους, his meaning, of necessity, is this,—“Beloved, thou shalt do like a Christian what thou shalt do for the brethren and strangers\*,” because no private trust, but the common tie of Christianity, obligeth to do good to Christian travellers, of whom he speaks there. And therefore, Acts ii. 38, 44, St. Peter having said to those that were pricked in heart upon conviction of the resurrection of our Lord, “Repent ye and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins,” and this being done; it followeth,—“But all the believers were together, and had all things common.”

§ 4. Here I must not forget the style and language of the most ancient fathers of the Church; who, deriving from and

\* "Potest et hic sensus accipi, tutum reddis, sive in tuto collocas: aut hic, rem Christianam facis." Erasm. in loc.; ap. Crit. Sac., tom. vii. p. 4673.—"Ut fidentem Christianumque decet."

Castal. in loc.; ibid., p. 4675.—"Hinc τὸ πιστὸν quod dignum est Christiano. 3 Joh. v. 5. πιστὸν ποιεῖς sc. ἔργον, agis ut decet Christianum: coll. v. 4." Schleusn. Lex. in voc. πιστός.

BOOK referring all their studies to the Scriptures, must needs  
II.

speak in the same style with them in matters of Christianity. I do not intend therefore to say, that they do not use the word faith to signify the belief of those things which the Gospel declareth to be true, and that trust and confidence in God, through Christ, which the truth thereof naturally tendeth to produce; having shewed, that both these conceptions are frequently signified by the term of faith in the writings of the Apostles, their masters: but I say further, that it is oftentimes used by them in this third sense, which I spake of last, to signify Christianity; that is, the profession thereof, presumed by the Church not to be counterfeit. This is very visible in Tertullian, in whose language faith and baptism are many times the same thing. *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, cap. i.; "*Nec secundas post fidem nuptias permittitur nosse*"—"and is not permitted to know any second marriage after baptism<sup>t</sup>." *De Pudicitia*, cap. xvi.; "*Quæ amisso viro fidem ingressa*"—"she who entered into the faith having lost her husband"; that is, became a Christian. *Ibid.*, cap. xviii.; "*Ante fidem et post fidem*<sup>x</sup>" signifies "before and after baptism." Therefore in his *Scorpiace*, cap. viii.; "*Talia a primordio et præcepta et exempla debitorum martyrii fidem ostendunt*<sup>y</sup>"—"such precepts, such examples, from the beginning shew, that faith is indebted in martyrdom<sup>y</sup>." For it is baptism, that obliges a Christian to martyrdom rather than renounce the faith. So St. Cyprian, following his master, *Epist. ad Antonianum*; "*Si fidei calor prævalet*"—"if the heat of faith prevail<sup>z</sup>." And *De Opere et Eleemosyna*; "*Credientium fides novo adhuc fidei calore fervebat*"—<sup>34</sup> "the faith of believers was fervent with the heat of faith being yet new<sup>a</sup>." For so Tertullian had said of Marcion in the place alleged in the first Book<sup>b</sup>, *Cont. Marc.* iv. 4; "*In primo calore fidei Catholice*"—"in the first zeal of the Catholic faith"; that is, of his professing it, being reconciled to the Church<sup>c</sup>. For these things are properly attributed

<sup>t</sup> Tertull., *Op.*, p. 555. D. ed. Rigalt., Lutet. Paris. 1664:—the passage is from the *De Pudicitia*, c. i. The reference in the text is a mistake.

<sup>u</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 568. D.

<sup>x</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 570. D.

<sup>y</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 494. A.

<sup>z</sup> Cypr., *Op.*, p. 102; *Epist.* lv. ed. Fell. See also *Epist.* lxxii. Ad Stephan., *ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>a</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 208.

<sup>b</sup> Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Christ. Tr., c. xvi. § 37. note l.

<sup>c</sup> Tertull., *Op.*, p. 415. B:—"Quum



to the profession of Christianity, but [not] to barely believing that it is true, afar off, and at a great distance. Cornelius, in his letter to Fabius bishop of Antiochia concerning Novatianus (in Eusebius *Eccles. Hist.* vi. 43<sup>d</sup>), thus describeth Celerinus, having been persecuted for the faith;—'Ανὴρ ὃς πάσας βασάνους διὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλεον καρτερικώτατα διένεγκας, καὶ τῇ ῥώμῃ τῆς πίστεως τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιβρώσας"—"a man who, having most stoutly, through the mercy of God, passed through all tortures, and confirmed the weakness of his flesh by the strength of his faith;" which strength is not in the mind that judgeth Christianity to be true, but by the resolution of the will to stick to it. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* ii.<sup>e</sup>, alleges Plato:—that in civil commotions the greatest virtue a man can meet with is faith; to wit, in him whom a man trusts; though the greatest happiness be peace, which makes it needless:—inferring thus; "ἐκ δὴ τούτων καταφαίνεται μεγίστη μὲν εὐχὼν τὸ εἰρήνην ἔχειν, μεγίστη δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ πίστις"—"whereby it appears, that the greatest of wishes is to have peace, the greatest of virtues faith<sup>i</sup>." Which he would not have alleged for the commendation of the Christian faith, had he not understood it to consist in that trust which a man sincerely engageth, as well as in that credit which a man giveth. Whereby we may understand, why, in another place<sup>z</sup>, he will have the title of πιστοὶ or the faithful, for Christians, to hold the same reason with that of Theognis<sup>h</sup> (when he commends a faithful friend,—

"Πιστὸς ἀνὴρ χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου ἀντιφέρεισθαι  
"Ἄξιός ἐν χαλεπῇ, Κύρνε, διχοστασίῃ,"—

[ἀντερό-  
σασθαι.]

et pecuniam in primo calore fidei Catholicæ Ecclesiæ contulit, projectam mox cum ipso (Evangeliio Lucæ) posteaquam in hæresim suam a nostra veritate descivit."

<sup>d</sup> pp. 242, 243. ed. Vales.

<sup>e</sup> Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, lib. ii. c. 5; Op., p. 441. ed. Potter: from Plato, *De Legibus*, lib. i.; Op., tom. vii. p. 432. ed. Bekker.

<sup>f</sup> Id., *ibid.*—"Μεγίστη μὲν εὐχὴ, τὸ εἰρήνην ἔχειν, κατὰ Πλάτωνα; μεγίστη δὲ ἀρετῶν μήτηρ, ἡ πίστις."

<sup>g</sup> Theodoret (*De Affect. Græc. Curat.*, *Serm.* i.; Op., tom. iv. p. 476. A.) quotes these verses of Theognis as illustrative of Christian faith:—"Θεόγνης δ

Σικελιώτης ποιητῆς, τῆς πίστεως ἀναγορεύει τὸν τρόφιμον, καὶ φησί· Πιστὸς ἀνὴρ," κ.τ.λ. . . "Εἰ δὲ τὸν ἐν στάσει πιστὸν χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου τιμώτερον ἔφη, τίνος ἀντάξιον ἀποφάνηται ἂν τις τὸν τοῖς θεοῖς λόγοις ἀναμφιβόλως πιστεύοντα;—and Plato also cites them in the passage referred to by S. Clem. Alex. (as quoted note e above): and, thirdly, Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, p. 574. C. But no allusion appears to be made to them by St. Clement himself in any part of his works. See Welcker's *Theognis*, p. 75, Francof. 1826.

<sup>h</sup> Theogn., *Gnom.* 77 78. ed. Bekker.

BOOK  
II.

that "he is worth gold and silver, in a civil dissension"): because he places the faith of a Christian in the obligation of Christianity which he undertakes, when he expresseth that the honour, which it imports, lies in the performing of it. As Lydia, when she entreateth St. Paul in these terms, Acts xvi. 15, "If ye judge me faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there," presseth him, if he think her a true Christian (as she had professed herself), that is, faithful to God and His Church, which she must be obliged to upon the trust that she had taken upon her in becoming a Christian. Therefore, disputing not long afore against Basilides and Valentinus the heretics, who made men's faith to depend necessarily upon the frame of their natures:—"Οὐκέτ' οὖν προαιρέσεως κατόρθωμα ἡ πίστις εἰ φύσεως πλεονέκτημα, οὐδ' ἀμοιβῆς δικαίας τεύχεται ἀναλτίος ὢν ὁ μὴ πιστεύσας, καὶ οὐκ αἷτιος ὁ πιστεύσας· πᾶσα δὲ ἡ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἀπιστίας ιδιότης καὶ διαφορὰ, οὐτ' ἐπαίνου οὔτε μὴν ψόγου ὑποπέσοι ἄν"—"therefore is faith no longer the achievement of choice, if it be the advantage of nature; nor shall he that believes not be justly recompensed being blameless, he that believeth being no cause; nor shall the property, or otherwise, of faith or unbelief be subject to praise or dispraise<sup>1</sup>." And by and by:—"Ποῦ δέ ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ ποτὲ ἀπίστου μετάνοια, δι' ἣν ἄφεσις ἀμαρτιῶν; ὥστε οὐδὲ βάπτισμα ἔτι εὐλογον, οὐδὲ μακαρία σφραγίς, οὐδ' ὁ Υἱὸς οὐδ' ὁ Πατήρ, ἀλλ' ἄθεος οἶμαι ἡ τῶν φύσεων αὐτοῖς εὕρεσκειται διανομή, τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας τὴν ἐκούσιον πίστιν μὴ ἔχουσα"—"but where becomes the repentance of unbelievers, through which comes remission of sins? so that neither shall baptism be any more reasonable, nor the blessed seal" (the gift of the Holy Ghost by baptism), "nor the Son, nor the Father" (from Whom it is expected); "only the distribution of natures according to them will be found utterly without God, not having for the foundation of salvation voluntary faith<sup>k</sup>." So the voluntary engagement which baptism expressly enacteth, is that faith whereby a Christian claims the promises of the Gospel. I know the

[διαφορῆς in orig.]

[ποῦ δὲ ἐστίν, ed. Potter.]

[ἀλλὰ θεός, Heins. Potter.]

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. ii. c. 3; Op., p. 434.<sup>k</sup> Id., ibid. "Ἄλλ' ἄθεος" appears to be Thorndike's own emendation.



words of St. Augustin may here be objected, *Enchirid.*, cap. xxxi.<sup>1</sup>:—"De hac enim fide loquimur quam adhibemus cum aliquid credimus, non quam damus cum aliquid pollicemur: nam et ipsa dicitur fides; sed aliter dicitur, non mihi habuit fidem; aliter, non mihi servavit fidem: nam illud est, non credit quod dixi; hoc, non fecit quod dixit"—"For," saith he, "we speak here of the credit, which we give when we believe something, not of that which we engage when we profess something: for that also is called faith; but a man means  
 35 one way when he says, he did not give me faith; another way when he says, he kept not faith with me: for that is, he believed not that which I said; this, he did not what he said." As if the consideration of trust to be kept or not to be kept, were utterly impertinent to the nature of justifying faith. For why were those that were not yet baptized, never called *fideles*, or believers, in the primitive Church, though they professed never so much to believe the Christian faith; but only *catechumeni*, hearers or scholars, or at the most, *competentes* or pretenders, when they put themselves forth actually to demand their baptism? Why? but to signify that the Church had not yet conceived confidence of their Christianity, because they had not yet engaged themselves in the profession of it. Which having solemnized by baptism, they were thenceforth called "faithful," the name signifying as well trusty as believers, having proceeded so far as to engage themselves to live as Christians, because they believed Christianity to come from God as it pretendeth. There would be no end if I should go about to produce the fathers for this name of Christians. One place or two shall serve for example. Tertullian, *De Exhort. Castitatis*, cap. iv:—"Spiritus quidem Dei etiam fideles habent, sed non omnes fideles Apostoli; . . . ergo, qui se fidelem dixerat, adjicit postea Spiritum Dei se habere, quod nemo dubitaret etiam de fidei"—  
 cap. [ "adjecit." ]  
 "and truly even Christians have the Spirit of God, yet are not all Christians Apostles; therefore" (St. Paul), "having called himself faithful" (or a Christian), "he adds afterwards, that he hath the Spirit of God, which no man would question in a Christian<sup>m</sup>." Whereupon, in his be

<sup>1</sup> The passage is in the Liber de Spiritu et Littera, c. xxxi. § 54; Op., tom. x. p. 3.  
 " "

BOOK xi.<sup>n</sup>, you find an antithesis or opposition between "*spiritualis*"  
II. and "*fidelis*," or a mere Christian, and one that had extraordinary endowments of God's Spirit. As, on the other side, *De Præscript.*, cap. xli.; "*Quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est*:"—speaking of the heretics, among them "it is uncertain, who is a professor, who a scholar<sup>o</sup>."

[Faith in a good Christian is in the affection of the will, not in the perfection of the understanding.]

§ 5. And, truly, he who considers all virtue to consist in the affection of the will, not in the perfection of the understanding; considering withal, that faith is (according to Clemens Alexandrinus, where afore) 'ἐκούσιος τῆς ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσις'—'a voluntary assent of the soul<sup>p</sup>;' or, 'πρόληψις ἐκούσιος, θεοσεβείας συγκατάθεσις'—a 'voluntary presumption and assent unto piety<sup>q</sup>;' shall find great reason to consider, what affection of the will it is wherein he places the virtue of faith in a good Christian. Especially experience on the one side shewing, that heretics, schismatics, and bad Christians (who cannot be thought to be endowed with that faith which recommends good ones), do really and truly believe all that truth which their sect or their lust is consistent with; and reason on the other side shewing, how the believing of it becomes reconcileable with the interest of their sect or of their lust. I suppose here, that the reason which makes the motives of faith, though sufficient, to become defeisible, is the cross of Christ: attending the profession of Christianity in time of persecution, but the performance of it always; because always difficult and laborious, always the following of Christ with His cross on our shoulders. When the powers of the world profess Christianity, then is the scandal of profession taken away, because they must cherish (so far must they needs be from persecuting) that which they profess; but the scandal of the cross in performing of it remains so much the more difficult to be avoided, by how much a man is more subject to be tempted by evil example to hope for salvation without performing it. Therefore, as I shewed you afore<sup>r</sup>, those who profess to believe the truth of Chris-

<sup>n</sup> Tertull., Op., p. 550. C: "A quocumque institutore sint, sive spiritali, sive tantum fideli."

<sup>o</sup> Id., ibid., p. 217. B.

<sup>p</sup> Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. ii. c. 6; Op., pp. 443, 444:—"Ἐκούσιος πρὸ

ἀποδείξεως συγκατάθεσις."

<sup>q</sup> Id., ibid., p. 444;—"Καὶ ἡ μὲν πίστις ὑπόληψις ἐκούσιος καὶ πρόληψις εὐγνώμονος προκαταλήψεως."

<sup>r</sup> Above, c. iv. § 5.



tianity, many times delayed their baptism in the primitive Church; whether as loth to retire to that strictness of life which it required, or as sensible of their own weakness, and desiring to find confidence of themselves that they might walk worthy of it, before they undertook it. Whereupon Tertullian, as I shewed you\*, advises to defer it, till a man were settled in a state of continence or wedlock. And because the reason of this delay was doubtful, therefore there remained in the Church some doubt of the salvation of those that died in this estate.

§ 6. But to him that should resolve to wear the profession <sup>[Unfruitful faith.]</sup> for a quality rendering him capable of the privileges of a Christian by the laws of Christian powers, but to fulfil it no further than the law should require, to him is the scandal of Christ's cross quite voided; though by as great a scandal as that which diverts from Christianity, namely, that of Simon Magus, who became a Christian for gain. He that expressly resolves not this within himself, but in the effect of his life and conversation hath no more regard to the reason of his Christianity than if he had expressly resolved it, is necessarily of the same form; and all that care not to perform what they undertake, according to the rank and degree of their negligence, reducible to it.

§ 7. But besides it is manifest, that during the heat of persecution, those that believed not the whole faith of a Christian, that is, heretics; those, who for matters not concerning the faith broke the unity of the Church, that is, schismatics; were many times ready to suffer death for their sect, and for that part of Christianity which it allowed: so far were they from disbelieving it. Shall we say, that any of these had in them the virtue of faith? Let us consider what might move them to believe: and it will appear, first, that they might be moved to believe that for their own sake, which a Christian believes for God's sake; then, that it can be no part of the virtue of faith to believe the truth for a man's own sake and not for God's. If sensuality can move a worldly man to believe the truth, so long as the advantages of the world attend it, well may it be said to be the grace of God that gives him sufficient reason to believe (supposing for the present, not

\* Above, c. iv. § 6.

BOOK  
II.

granting, that these reasons are the helps of God's free grace to bring men to believe): but that he sets himself in God's stead, in believing that for his own advantage which he should believe out of obedience to God and for His service, is not grace but wickedness; be it never so true, never so holy, that he believes. He that disbelieves part of that which it is necessary to salvation to believe, he that breaks the unity of the Church upon true grounds though not necessary (for who can make a sect without some pretence in our common Christianity?); he hath the fulfilling of his own will and singularity for his reward, and cannot claim that faith to be a grace of God, which God rewardeth not. Nor is this to say, that the least beginning of faith is to be had without God's grace (supposing for the present, but not granting, that the work of salvation is the work of God's preventing grace, from the very beginning of it); but that there may be a real belief of Christian truth in the understanding of him, that hath no part of good will to be a true Christian: the fifth article of the council of Orange providing only "*initium fidei ipsumque credulitatis affectum*"—"that the beginning of faith, and the very inclination to believe," be thought to come—"per inspirationem Spiritus Sancti, corrigentem voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem"—"by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, correcting our will from unbelief to faith, from ungodliness to godliness<sup>t</sup>." For though, when first a man is shewed reason to believe, both these reasons and the least inclination to follow them be ascribed to God's grace (because the scandal of the cross is to be overcome, to which all that inclination tendeth); yet, when that scandal is voided by falling upon as great, the assent of the understanding remains the effect of human discourse upon the sufficiency of reasons proposed, all the goodness that otherwise must have been ascribed to God's grace in the inclination of the will, being void and dead.

[Faith in those who are baptized in infancy.]

§ 8. And all this, though properly said of those that are converted to Christianity at years of discretion, saving the difference between the cases, is punctually true in them that are bred Christians, supposing them to have the grace of the

<sup>t</sup> Concil. Arausican. II. (A.D. 529.) Art. 5; ap. Labb., Concil., tom. iv. pp. 1667. E, 1668. A.



Holy Ghost by being baptized infants, and to have destituted the same afterwards: the belief that remains in them being merely the effect of human discourse upon the motives of faith (which are indeed helps of grace) without us, without any respect of submission to the will of God for the effect of them within us; which who giveth, cannot be so wanting to the grace of God as we suppose these.

CHAP.  
VI.

§ 9. But this being said, I shall now leave it to the reader 37 to judge, whether this may have been the occasion, or upon what other occasion it may be thought to have come to pass, that, in the doctrine of the School, the inward act of believing, without the inward resolution of outwardly professing, hath been taken for the whole virtue of faith; I say, without including that inward resolution of the heart, whence that outward profession proceedeth when it is true, and is always presumed by the Church to proceed, when the contrary appears not: and that from hence have proceeded the disputes concerning 'faith without form' (which they will have to be that dead faith without works, which St. James, ii. 17, 19, 20, compareth with the faith of devils, that "believe and tremble"), and 'faith informed by the love' of God; which they will not have to add any thing to the nature of it, so that it shall consist in any thing else than in believing the truth of the Gospel; but to qualify it to justify him that before was a sinner to God, as containing in it all the righteousness of a Christian<sup>u</sup>. But though at the present I determine not, what is true in this position, what not; I must determine as to the point in hand, that the nature of that faith, to which the Scriptures of the Apostles, and the most ancient fathers of the Church, ascribe remission of sins, and that righteousness which the Gospel holdeth forth, together with other promises of the same, is no way declared by this resolution, but

Of the informed and formed faith of the schools.

<sup>u</sup> "Probatur . . . fidem justificantem non esse fiduciam misericordiae sed solum assensum firum ac certum ad ea omnia quae Deus credenda proponit." Bellarm., *De Justific.*, lib. i. c. v.; *Contr.*, tom. iii. p. 942. A, B. Ingolst. 1593.—"Fides" (i. e. informis) "potest omnia credenda credere, et primae veritati super omnia; et esse cum peccato. Inde ergo manifestum est quod charitas non potest esse informis: fides vero potest." Alex. Alens.,

*Summ. P. III. Qu. lxiv. Memb. iv. § ad ultimum.*—"Fides igitur quam daemones et falsi Christiani habent, qualitas mentis est, sed informis, quia sine charitate." Pet. Lombard., *Sentent.*, lib. iii. distinct. xxiii.—"Fides informis et formata non differunt quantum ad objectum proprium fidei, quod est veritas una: ergo fides formata et informis non differunt specie." S. Thom. Aquin., *Ad Sentent.*, lib. iii. distinct. xxiii. qu. 3. art. 1. Sed contra.

**BOOK**  
**II.**

---

darkened. For it is manifestly requisite, for a due account of the sense as well of the most ancient fathers as of the Scriptures, that the nature of faith be understood to consist in that to which the said promises may duly be ascribed; which in both are so oft, so plainly, and so properly, ascribed to faith, not to any thing which may stand with it, or necessarily follow it. Now, though no man can resolve to profess Christianity without true love to God above all things, yet the Scriptures of the New Testament plentifully shew, that the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of love, is not given to reside habitually with any but those that are baptized and so become Christians; however necessary the actual assistance of the same Holy Ghost is, to go before and to induce them to become Christians, by undertaking what that profession requires. Therefore it will be necessary to distinguish, not only the faith, but the love, but the hope, the fear, the trust in God, and all other graces, begun in him, that beginneth to believe the Gospel to be true but is yet not resolved to undergo the profession of it and the condition which it supposes, from the same as they are in him, who upon such resolution is become a Christian. And if any man upon this distinction will say, that the faith which he believed with afore is faith without form, but formed afterwards, he shall easily have me to concur with him in it; always provided, that whatsoever it is the Scripture attributes the procuring of the promises of the Gospel to, that be understood to belong to the nature of that faith which alone justifies according to the Scriptures.



## CHAPTER VII.

THE LAST SIGNIFICATION OF FAITH IS PROPERLY JUSTIFYING FAITH: THE FIRST BY A METONYMY OF THE CAUSE; THE SECOND, OF THE EFFECT. THOSE THAT ARE NOT JUSTIFIED DO TRULY BELIEVE. THE TRUST OF A CHRISTIAN PRESUPPOSETH HIM TO BE JUSTIFIED. ALL THE PROMISES OF THE GOSPEL BECOME DUE AT ONCE BY THE COVENANT OF GRACE. THAT TO BELIEVE THAT WE ARE ELECT OR JUSTIFIED, IS NOT JUSTIFYING FAITH.

For now it is time to draw the argument which I purposed at first, from these premises: and to say, that the name of faith, by the effects which by virtue of the Gospel promises it produceth, being attributed, first, to the bare belief of the Gospel, secondly, to that trust which a Christian enters into by being baptized, and, lastly, to that trust in God through Christ which Christianity warranteth: and the second of these naturally presupposing the first, as the third both of them; the reason can be no other than this,—because the middle is that which entitleth Christians to the promise of the Gospel; in respect whereof, both the name of faith, and the effects of these promises, are duly and reasonably ascribed both to that which it supposeth, and to that which it produceth, both to the cause, and to the effect of it. For in all manner of language it is as necessary to use that change of words, and the sense of them, which is called metonymy by humanists, and by some philosophers and divines of the schools “*denominatio ab extrinseco*,” as it is impossible for any man to express his mind without that change of speech, which they call a trope, in any manner of language. It is not to be imagined, that those fashions of speech are only used for ornament and elegance of language; the humanists themselves having taught us, that they are as our clothes, as well to cover nakedness, as for comeliness\*. For as long as the conceits of the mind may be infinitely more than the words that have been used, it will be absolutely necessary to

The last signification of faith is properly justifying faith: the first, by a metonymy of the cause; the second, of the effect.

\* Auctor ad Herenn., lib. iv. c. 32. —And see e. g. Vazquez, In III. Part. S. Thom., Disp. cxxviii. c. iv. numm. 42—44.

\* “Quemadmodum autem vestimenta primo usurpata sunt, ut corpus muniretur adversus aeris injurias; ea-

dem tamen post etiam adhibita sunt ornatus et decoris gratia: itidem translata primo genuit necessitas, post celebravit delectatio.” Voss., Instit. Orator., lib. iv. c. v. § 14. p. 109. Lugd. Bat. 1630.

BOOK  
II.

strain the use of customary speech, as the conceit is not customary which we desire to express. It will not, therefore, be strange, that the name of faith should be used to signify three conceptions, distinct, but depending one on the other; so long as there are more conceptions than words. It will not be strange, that the effects of that trust which a man entereth into by undertaking the profession of a Christian, should be attributed both to that faith which believeth the Gospel to be true (being a thing necessarily presupposed to induce a man to undertake that engagement), and to that confidence which a Christian hath in God through Christ (being a thing necessarily ensuing upon the undertaking of it with a sincere and effectual purpose).

Those that  
are not jus-  
tified, do  
truly be-  
lieve.

§ 2. But this would be strange, and no just reason to be given for it; were it not granted that the second, to wit, that sincere undertaking the trust of a Christian, is that which really entitleth him to the promises of the Gospel. For is it not manifest to all Christians, that there are too many in the world, whom we cannot imagine to have any due title to those promises, and yet do really and verily believe the faith of Christ to be true, and Him and His Apostles sent from God to preach it? If therefore we will have those Scriptures which ascribe the promises of the Gospel to believing the truth of it to be true, we must understand them, by way of metonymy, to be attributed to it, as of right belonging to the consequence which it is naturally apt to produce. Nor is there any reason, that convinceth me in this point more, than that which Socinus giveth, why justification should be attributed to that act of faith alone whereby a man believes the Gospel to be true. His reason is, because he that thoroughly believes the true God and His providence, which will bring all men's doings to judgment, and render them their due reward of life or death; that believes our Lord Christ truly tendereth everlasting happiness to all that take His yoke upon them, and draw in it as long as they live; must needs stand convict, that he is to proceed accordingly<sup>y</sup>. I say no less; and I

<sup>y</sup> "Ea quæ Sibi obtemperantibus Christus eventura dixit, ejusmodi sunt, ut fieri non possit, quin is qui Ejus verba vera esse credat, Illi ex animo obediat. Beatitatem et vitam æternam

habitueros dixit Christus, quicumque Ipsius præcepta conservaverint. Quem autem invenies unquam, qui beatitatem et vitam æternam, sciens prudens, aut aspernetur, aut tanti non faciat, ut eas



say, that the preaching of the Gospel tenders motives sufficient to convict all the world of so much. But I say further, that so long as, notwithstanding sufficient conviction tendered, notwithstanding a man's faith engaged, and his own sentence past against himself if he fail, we see men, either not embrace Christianity, or not perform it having embraced it; so long, right to God's promises cannot be ascribed to this belief: though, in reason, whosoever is convict of the truth cannot deny but he ought to engage in Christianity and hold it. The reason is, because we see men not always do that which reasonably they ought to do: and, therefore, it is not enough to have submitted to conviction what we ought to do; and the promises of the Gospel are not properly ascribed to the belief of those truths, which convince men what they ought to do, but to the consequence thereof, which naturally and reasonably they are apt to produce, but do not necessarily produce.

CHAP.  
VII.

§ 3. Again, on the other side; trust and confidence in God, through Christ, obtains the promises of the Gospel: who denies it? But is this trust always well grounded and true? Is it not possible, for a man to imagine his title to the promises of the Gospel to be good when it is not? I would we had no cause to believe how oft it comes to pass. I grant, that at the first hearing and believing the Gospel, all the world have ground enough for that confidence, that may save them from despairing to attain the promises of it. But hath he, that hath ground not to despair of being justified by faith, ground to confide as justified by faith? Or is that all one, as to have ground enough for that confidence, that

The trust of a Christian presupposeth him to be justified.

quantumvis gravibus et multiplicibus incommodis atque malis comparandas censeat. . . . Ex quo factum est, ut Christo sive Christi verbis credere idem significet atque Illi obedire; quamvis per se nihil aliud vere significare possit, quam Ejus verba vera esse credere: Christo autem sive Ejus verbis non credere idem sit atque Illi non obedire." Socin., Disp. de Jesu Christo Serv., P. IV, c. xi; Op., tom. ii. p. 234. a.—"Ea credere quæ nobis Christus annuntiavit, non illa ipsa fides quæ nos justificat, sed ipsius quasi parens et causa est. Non solum enim Deus nos ad resipiscentiam per Christum invitavit; sed

resipiscentibus omnium delictorum in perpetuum veniam est pollicitus: nec solum ut ex Christi præscripto vitam institueremus, præcepit; sed Ejus præceptis obtemperantibus vitæ beatissimæ et in omne ævum duraturæ præmium constituit. . . Qui autem illis fidem habet, quia (ut diximus) eorum ingenti desiderio omnes tenemur, ut obediat atque confidat, necesse est. Et propterea, qui Christo sive Ejus verbis credit, justificatus esse dicitur." Id., ibid., p. 238. a.—"Nemo hominum potest Christi verba vera esse credere, quin Illi obediat." Id., ibid.

BOOK  
II.[1 Cor. ii.  
11.][Prayer-  
book vers.  
—"hope  
in Thee."]

they have right to the said promises? I suppose there is a great gulph between both. For when the preaching of the Gospel convinceth a man that he is lost unless he accept it, upon whatsoever condition it tendereth; it is enough to keep any man, that is in his wits, from despairing, to know that there is a condition tendered by God, the accepting whereof will entitle us to His promises: because, being sincerely tendered in God's name, there can be no bar but on our part to the accepting of it. But to have a well-grounded confidence of our own right and just title to the promises, it behoveth, that 'the spirit of a man, which is in him,' know, that there is in him a sincere resolution of accepting the conditions; which how much the better it is grounded and settled, so much more shall his confidence be secure. And to this confidence to bring a man from this former confidence, is as great a work, as to induce a man that believes the world to come, to prefer it before this. For I demand, is he that sins against God for love of this world, enemy to God (as the Apostle saith, James iv. 4), or not? Are not all men enemies to God, when the Gospel calls them to become His friends? If not, why may they not be saved without it? If so, can they have confidence in their enemy, by being discovered to be His enemies? Indeed, the Gospel tendering conditions of peace, they have confidence that they may become friends with God by embracing the same. But the confidence of friends, till they have embraced them, they cannot have. It is therefore as dangerous an imposture to invite an unregenerate man, so soon as he is discovered so to be, to the confidence of a Christian in God through Christ; as not to invite him to that confidence, who may be a Christian, is to drive him to despair. For not presupposing his conversion from sin to God, it is necessarily carnal presumption, not the confidence of a Christian. And if the Spirit of God should seal to any heart the promises of the Gospel, not presupposing this ground, it were not possible for any man to discern the illusions of the evil Spirit from the dictates of God's; the conscience of our submission to those terms being the only test by which the difference is discernible. For "all they that trust in Thee shall not be ashamed, but such as transgress without a cause shall be put to confusion;" Psalm xxv. 2. To "transgress with-



out a cause," and to 'put trust in God,' are terms incompatible. So that, wheresoever we are bid trust in God (being implicitly forbid trust in the world, or ourselves, which all that love the world, or themselves, not in order to God, necessarily do), there is supposed the ground of this trust, inconsistent with the conscience of sin. And though this ungrounded confidence importeth carnal presumption, yet may it occasion despair. For when the guilt of sin in the conscience, stronger than all prejudicate opinion and imposture of false doctrine, discovers that there is no ground for the confidence of a Christian; and prejudice on the other side admits no recourse to that condition which is the ground of it; no marvel if it seem impossible to attain peace of conscience, which appearance is the very horror of despair. Seeing then, that trust in God as reconcilable, and for the attaining of remission of sins, is the immediate fruit of the Gospel believed; but trust in God as reconciled, which is confidence of remission of sins obtained, is necessarily the consequence of that faith which justifieth (the justification of a Christian, being a sinner before a Christian, necessarily implying remission of sins): what remaineth, but that the professing of faith to God, for the undergoing of Christianity, be the condition upon which the promises of the Gospel become due, that is to say, that faith which alone justifieth?

10 § 4. For it is true the Gospel tendereth several promises; remission of sins in the first place, because the first thing a man convict and sentenced to death seeks, is his discharge. But no man can have this discharge, but upon the same terms he must become the son of God (whether as regenerate by grace, or as adopted to glory, that is, to the right and title of it); and upon the same terms be sanctified by the Holy Ghost, which (as I shewed before\*) is promised as a gift, that is, habitually to be possessed, only to Christians and to all Christians. And, therefore, it is impossible to imagine a man discharged of his sins, that is not, for the very same reason, and therefore at the same instant, of nature as well as of time, regenerate, adopted, and sanctified. It is indeed to be granted, that justification signifies something different from all these promises: inasmuch as it is manifest, that in

CHAP.  
VII.

All the promises of the Gospel become due at once by the covenant of grace.

\* Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. iii. § 3—8; and above, c. ii. § 7—9.

## BOOK II. the language of the Scriptures it importeth, not making of

a man righteous, but declaring him and accounting him righteous, treating him and dealing with him as righteous<sup>a</sup>. All this is true; and yet I shall not grant, that it is so properly understood to be the act of God as sitting upon His throne of judgment (whether according to mercy or justice<sup>b</sup>), as the act of God contracting with man for everlasting life, upon condition of submitting to the covenant of grace and the terms of it<sup>c</sup>.

§ 5. Indeed, the preaching of the Gospel premises the general judgment to come, as tendering the way to come clear of it; to wit, by Christ, whom it declareth Judge of quick and dead. For St. Paul thus proposeth it to the Athe-

<sup>a</sup> So also Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Prior, c. i. § 1—7; Works, vol. iii. pp. 4—10: against Grotius.—“On the other hand, “*Verbum Justificari forensem seu judiciale significationem in Scriptura sæpe habere, immo et in quibusdam D. Pauli locis quæ de justificatione nostra loquuntur, libenter concedunt multi Romanenses; i. e. idem significare quod justum pronunciarum seu declarari, &c. . . . Sed et verbum justificari quandoque etiam in Scriptura significare justitia imbui vel donari, non diffidentur permulti docti Protestantes: contra aliorum rigidiorum id pertinaciter negantium sententiam. Rom. viii. 38, . . . Tit. iii. 7,*” &c. (citing Beza, Zanchy, and others.) Forbes, Consid. Mod. et Pac., De Justif., lib. ii. c. iv. § 6, 7. sq. pp. 62 sq. Londin. 8vo. 1658.—See also Bp. Andrewes, Sermons, vol. v. pp. 114—119. Oxf. 1843: Field, Of the Church, Append. to Bk. iii. c. ii. p. 291. Oxf. 1828: and Waterland, Summary View of Doctrine of Justification, § i.; Works, vol. ix. p. 429.

<sup>b</sup> “*Si vero sic justus est Deus ut simul sit et misericors, . . . quid aliud consequitur quam duplicem Ille esse thronum, judicii unum, gratiæ alterum: et ad thronum judicii pertinere, quando justificat justum et condemnat impium; ad alterum vero, qui gratiæ est, referendum esse, quando impium non condemnat.*” Musculus, Loci Communes, De Justif., c. iii. p. 267. A. Basil. 1599.

<sup>c</sup> “God, the supreme Lawgiver, may be considered either as a Rector and Governor contracting with man, and laying down the terms of His covenant;

or as a Judge giving sentence according to the terms laid down. Correspondently, man may be considered either as accepting the terms upon his entering into covenant; or as pleading them afterwards at the bar of justice, at the Divine tribunal. There is no more difference between these two several views of the same thing, than there is between the issuing out a general grant for the benefit of all persons who shall duly and properly accept it; and the actual conferring the benefit of that grant upon the persons so accepting: but some have chosen one view for the easier and after explaining (as they conceived) the nature of justification; and some have preferred the other, for the like reasons.” Waterland, as before quoted, p. 428; quoting Thorn-dike.—“In the Scriptures then there is a double righteousness set down. . . . A righteousness accounted. And . . . a righteousness done. . . . The one is a quality of the party. The other an act of the judge declaring or pronouncing righteous . . . The prophet” (Jerem. xxiii. 6) “setteth One before us in His royal judicial power in the person of a King, and of a King set down to execute judgment; and this he telleth us, before he thinks meet to tell us His name. Before this King thus set down in His throne, there to do judgment, the righteousness that will stand against the law, our consciences, Satan, sin, the gates of hell and the power of darkness, . . . that is righteousness indeed, that is it we seek for, if we may find it. And that is not this latter but the former only.” Andrewes, Sermon, vol. v. pp. 114, 115.



nians, Acts xvii. 30, 31: "God, Who oversaw the times of CHAP. ignorance, now chargeth all men every where to repent; be- VII.  
cause He hath appointed a day, wherein He will judge the world righteously, by the Man whom He hath appointed, making faith hereof to all by raising Him from the dead." And of the overture thereof which he made to Felix, St. Luke saith, Acts xxiv. 25; "As he discoursed of righteousness, and temperance, and judgment to come." And St. Paul, speaking of the Gospel, Rom. i. 18: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, that hold the truth in unrighteousness." For the preaching of the Gospel is that revelation which here he means. And by St. Augustin, *De Catechizandis Rudibus*<sup>a</sup>, we understand, that by the order of the Church there was no instruction in Christianity without conviction of the judgment to come; as that which obligeth to have recourse to baptism for the avoiding of it. But when God condescends to tender to those, whom He holds liable to His justice, terms of reconciliation, plainly He comes down from His throne of judgment, to deal with His obnoxious creatures upon equal terms, or rather terms of disadvantage; supposing, what no Christian can deny, that the Gospel tenders terms of our advantage. Nay, He is content to go before, and to declare Himself tied beforehand if we accept; expecting our choice, whether we will be bound by accepting, or not: which is a difference between the Law and the Gospel, not unworthy to be observed. For the covenant of the Law was struck once for all with all those whom it concerned, to wit, the whole people of Israel at once; their posterity being by birth subject to it. But when the Gospel is preached, the covenant of grace is tendered indeed, but not enacted till some man consent to become a Christian; and, therefore, God first binds Himself to stand to the terms which He tenders, expecting whether man will accept them or not. And though it be called the covenant of grace while it is but tendered, yet it is not a covenant till it be enacted between God and every one that is baptized.

§ 6. Seeing then, that no justification of sinners takes effect

<sup>a</sup> S. Aug., *De Catech. Rud.*, cc. 27, 45, 47; *Op.*, tom. vi. pp. 281. F. G, 282. A, 291. B. C, 292. A.

BOOK  
II.

but by virtue of the covenant of grace, and that the act of God's mere grace enacts and gives force to that covenant; manifest it must needs be, that justification imports the act of God, admitting him for righteous, who, setting aside that covenant, could not challenge so to be held and dealt with. But if justification import this act of God, shall it not therefore imply, shall it not suppose, some condition qualifying him for it? For what challenge can he, whom the Gospel overtaketh in sin, pretend for reward by it, being engaged by God's law to the utmost of his power otherwise? Shall a<sup>41</sup> man's conversion from sin past to righteousness to come, challenge both the cancelling of his debts, and a reward beyond all proportion of that which he is able to do, being obliged to do it? But shall that Gospel, which pretends to retrieve righteousness into the world, allow the reward of righteousness without any consideration of it? How then shall it oblige man to righteousness, being a law, that derogates from any law of God that went afore it, allowing all the promises it tenders without any consideration of righteousness? For I will not here stand to dispute, whether the covenant of grace be a law or not<sup>e</sup>: because every contract is a law to the parties; and this, being between God and man, and supposing the transgression of God's original law, necessarily abates the extent and force of it. But I will demand, what is, or what can be, the righteousness of a sinner, but

<sup>e</sup> "Hoc ideo curiosius observandum, ne errorem erremus quem Lutherus et post eum nostratum theologorum plerique in disputationibus suis de justificatione contra pontificios, nimio contradicendi æstu abrepti, in ecclesias reformatas maximo earum malo invexerunt: scil. Evangelium ex puris putis promissis constare; Christum dedisse mundo legem nullam; id tantum egisse ut legem prius datam exponeret; . . . legis moralis usum eum nunc esse unicum, ut per ipsam homines ad fidem Christi adducantur, vel saltem ut sit arbitraria quædam vivendi regula, a Christo quidem nobis commendata, . . . nequaquam vero sub periculo animæ. . . nobis imposita." Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Prior, cap. iii. § 3; Works, vol. iii. p. 40.—"Fatetur autem evangelium in Scriptura *legem fidei*, *legem Christi*, *legem libertatis*, æquivoce appellari phrasi Hebraica, quoniam He-

bræis vox תורה *lex* late doctrinam significat: quo significato Christum esse legiferum, legislatorem, id est, doctorem, allegatis probari concedimus. Cæterum de mente adversarii Evangelium est lex proprie dicta, h. e. doctrina, tradens nova et perfectiora Decalogo præcepta, quorum impletione justificari et servari nos oporteat: Christus est novus legislator," &c. "Verum enimvero hæc pestilens opinio monachorum evertit totum Christianismum, obscurat officium, tollit beneficium Christi, nec differt nisi appellatione ab Ethnicorum, Judæorum, Turcarum, Paganorum aliorum falsis opinionibus de justificatione per opera coram Deo." Pareus, De Justificatione Impii Libb. v. adv. Bellarmin., lib. iv. c. iii. p. 1007. Heidelb. 1615.—See Forbes, Considerationes Mod. et Pac., De Justific., lib. iv. c. ii. pp. 131, sq.; and above, c. iii. § 6—9.



repentance? Which, as it is part of righteousness, so far as it is understood to be conversion from any<sup>f</sup> sin; so, as it is understood to be the conversion of sinners to Christianity, is all righteousness, because all sinners are called to Christianity. Only with this difference, that repentance is the way to that end, which is righteousness; repentance '*in fieri*,' righteousness '*in facto esse*,' according to the terms of the School. And is it not righteousness for a sinner, to desire, to purpose, to resolve to be righteous, for the time to come? Or can he, that is truly qualified a sinner, be any other way truly qualified righteous? Therefore that resolution of righteousness, which he that sincerely undertakes Christianity must needs put on (the first part whereof is the profession of God, by Christ, the author and rewarder of it); this, I say, is that which qualifies a Christian for the promises of the Gospel: but always by virtue of God's free act in tendering the covenant of grace; not by any obligation, which His creature can prevent Him with. And this is manifestly St. Paul's sense in Rom. iv. 3—11, 22—24: where he alleges Moses, that Abraham's faith "was imputed to him for righteousness;" and David, pronouncing him "blessed unto whom God imputeth no sin;" to shew, that the Gospel declareth Christians to be justified by faith no otherwise, than the fathers understood men to become righteous,—by God's grace accepting that which nothing could oblige Him to accept for righteousness. For no man is so wilfully blind as to imagine, that the Apostle speaks here of our Lord Christ the object, not of the act, of faith<sup>g</sup>: whose words are, that "faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness," and, "Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth not sin:" and sin, as I take it, stands not in opposition to the object of faith. And when the Scripture saith (Psalm cvi. 30, 31), "Then stood up Phineas, and executed judgment, and so the plague ceased; and this was imputed to him for righteousness among all posterities for evermore;" it is manifest, that doing vengeance upon male-

[Heb. xi.  
6.][“Executed judgment.”  
Bible vers.]

Corrected from MS. “all,” in orig. text.

<sup>g</sup> “Fides non dicitur esse ipsa justitia, sed censi pro justitia seu imputari ad justitiam, non utique absolute (sic enim est unica virtus, non tota justitia), sed

relate, ratione sui objecti quod respicit et apprehendit, hoc est, Christi cum sua justitia.” Pareus, De Justif. adv. Belarm., lib. i. c. xvii. pp. 290, 291: commenting on Rom. iv. 5.

BOOK  
II.

factors is accounted a righteous thing for Phineas to do, though by God's command, yet without process of law. And 1 Macc. ii. 52; "Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was counted to him for righteousness?" And shall not faith be said to be "imputed to him for righteousness" in the same sense, as we see evidently enduring temptation is imputed to him, and doing vengeance to Phineas, for righteousness? That is to say, that the act of faith, not the object of it (which act, what it is, and wherein it consists, I suppose is decided by the premises), is imputed to Abraham and his spiritual seed for righteousness.

That to believe we are elect or justified, is not justifying faith.

§ 7. I have said nothing all this while concerning that opinion, which makes that faith which alone justifieth, to consist in believing that a man is justified, or predestinate to life, in consideration only of Christ's obedience imputed to him<sup>h</sup>. And, truly, having said so much, why it cannot

<sup>h</sup> See below, note k; and cc. xxx. xxxi. Thorndike alludes to the Scotch Presbyterian Rutherford principally (see Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vi.); and does not fix the doctrine in an *unqualified* way on the English Presbyterians (see above, c. i. § 9). The point of course here is, not whether the true believer does or does not certainly believe in his own individual salvation, but that his so believing is the *essence* of justifying faith. And many whose words commit them to the tenet, shrink from avowing it when taxed directly with holding it. The following quotations might be multiplied indefinitely from writers of the same class and time.—"Fides" (i. e. *ea qua justificamur*) "significat amplecti omnes articulos fidei, et in hunc articulum, credo remissionem peccatorum: nec tantum aliis eam dari credo sed mihi quoque." Confess. Belg., art. de Remiss. Pecc. et Justificatione.—And similarly, Catech. Heidelb., Qu. 21.—"Item docent (Protestantes) quod homines . . . gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, Qui Sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram Ipso." Confess. August., § 4: ap. Melanchth. Op., tom. i. fol. 29. a. Witeb. 1580.—"Hæc igitur fides specialis qua credit unusquisque sibi remitti peccata

propter Christum, et Deum placatum et propitium esse propter Christum, consequitur remissionem peccatorum et justificat nos." Melanchth., Apol. Confess. August., c. de Justific.; Op., tom. i. fol. 63. b, 64. a: and in similar words, *ibid.*, c. de Pœnitentia; *ibid.*, fol. 87. a.—"By justifying faith wee understand not onely the common beleeve of the articles of Christian religion, and a perswasion of the truth of God's worde in generall: but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospell to the comfort of our owne soules: whereby we lay hold on Christ with all His benefits, hauing an earnest trust," &c. "So that a true beleueer may bee certaine, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiveness of his sinnes, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ." Irish Articles, § 37, in Append. num. iv. to Elrington's Life of Ussher (Works, vol. i.) p. xl.—"Cum fide nos justificari dicimus: intelligimus, nos per fidem certo persuasos esse, Deum nobis justitiam imputare, seu peccata remittere, propter satisfactionem sive obedientiam Christi," &c. Piscator, Thes. Theol., lib. ii. loc. 8. pp. 62, 63. Herb. Nass. 1607.—"Fides justificans est credere sibi remitti peccata propter Christum." Pareus, De Justif. adv. Bellarm., lib. i. c. xi. p. 177: with no other explanation than "Nec tam inepte loquimur Deum justificare eos qui credunt se justificari, sed qui credunt et confidunt Christum



consist in having trust and confidence in God through Christ; I do not think I need say much more to it. First, CHAP.  
VII.

esse traditum pro suis peccatis," &c. Id., *ibid.*, p. 176.—"Illud omnino est quod fidem appellamus, tantopere in Scriptura commendatum: nempe, quum aliquis sibi certo persuadet promissiones salutis et vitæ æternæ ad se singulatim et proprie pertinere . . . Quum enim quis certe apud se statuit sese ad salutem vitamque æternam in Christo destinatum, omnino fit particeps omnium Christi beneficiorum in vitam æternam, quum in eum finem Christus illi offeratur." Beza, *Confess. Brev.*, § xix. pp. 263, 264. *Genev.* 1587.—"Quisquis autem remissa sibi peccata esse credit, eum ipsa fides absolvit." Whitaker, *Respons. ad X. Ration. Edm. Campian.*, *Resp. ad Ration.* viii.; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 41 b.—"Faith is a wonderful grace of God, by which the elect do apprehend and apply Christ and all His benefits unto themselves particularly. . . . This apprehending of Christ is not done by any corporall touching Him, but spiritually by assurance; which is, when the elect are persuaded in their own hearts by the Holy Ghost of the forgiveness of their owne sinnes and of God's infinite mercie towards them in Jesus Christ. . . . The things which the Spirit of God maketh knowne to the faithfull particularly, are their justification, adoption, sanctification, eternal life." Perkins, *Estate of a true Christian in this life*, § 4, 5: *Works*, vol. i. pp. 362. col. 1. D, 363. col. 1. A, B. *Lond.* 1616. "If a man beleefe Christ and the kingdom of heaven to be his, it is his indeede." Id., *Christ the True and Perfecte Gain*, *ibid.*, p. 662. col. 1. D, 2. A. "Nay, this I believe" (viz. "that God is true in His promises"), "and more too, that I particularly am in the number of those men which shall bee saved by the merit of Christ's death and passion: and this is the belief that saveth me." Id., *Conflicts of Sathan with the Christian*, *ibid.*, p. 406. col. 1. B.—For Rutherford, see below in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Church, c. vi.—On the other hand, when Bellarmine (*De Justificatione*, lib. iii. c. 3) charged Protestants with holding among other tenets, that "hac ipsa fide," scil. a special faith in the remission of the individual believer's own sins, "et sola hac fide homines justificari," Pareus replied (*De Justif. adv. Bellarm.*, lib.

iii. c. 3. pp. 618, 619), that "Nequaquam dicimus . . . nos hac ipsa fide justificari qua credimus nos justificari. Esset enim hæc inanis illusio et *ταυτολογία*, Fides justificat quæ vel quia justificat. . . . Nam fides nec ideo justificat quia justificat, nec quia credit se justificari: nec ideo certa est, quia justificat: sed ideo justificat et certa est, quia promissionem Evangelii, quam intuetur et accipit, certo scit atque confidit non posse fallere."—And Chamier also (*Panstrat.*, tom. iii. lib. xiii. c. 4. num. 16. p. 410); "Et vero longe aliud est fidelem certum esse sibi remissa esse peccata, aliud propterea ei remitti peccata quod certus sit: monstra hæc sunt." (See however Downham, *Coven. of Grace*, c. viii. pp. 95, 96. *Dubl.* 1631).—Again, the same Bishop Downham, in England (*Treatise of Justification*, lib. vi. c. 4. § 8. pp. 353, 354. *Lond.* 1633, also answering Bellarmine), distinguishing two senses of the term "special faith," the one referring to "the justification of a sinner before God in the Court of Heaven by imputation of Christ's righteousness apprehended by a lively assent or beleefe," the other to "our justification in the Court of our owne Conscience, when we are perswaded and in some measure assured of our justification," adds, that "if that only be called speciall faith, by which we are justified in our own consciences, that is, assured of our justification, that assurance arising from the actual application of the promise to ourselves, then I say and avouch, that this special faith is not that by which we are justified before God."—See also Wotton, *De Reconciliatione Peccatoris*, Pars I. lib. ii. c. 14. § 6, and c. 15. § 7. *Basil.* 1624; and Downham's other tract, the *Coven. of Grace*, c. viii. p. 95.—And to come nearer still, Dr. Owen, in his *Salus Electorum Sanguis Jesu* (lib. iii. c. viii. § 5). "If the sinner wants nothing to acceptation and peace but a manifestation of Christ's eternall love, then evangelicall justification is nothing but an apprehension of God's eternall decree and purpose: but this cannot be made out from the Scripture, viz. that God's justifying of a person is His making knowne unto him His decree of election, or man's justification an apprehension of that decree, purpose, or love. Where is any such thing in the

BOOK  
II.

whether or no a Christian can have the assurance of faith, that he is for the present justified, or that he is from everlasting predestinate to life, is a thing that I intend not here either to grant or to deny; nothing hindering me (supposing for the present<sup>i</sup>, but not granting, that such assurance may be had), upon that supposition to dispute, that he is not justified by having that assurance, but that by being justified he obtains it. For were it not the strangest thing in the world, that any knowledge should produce the object of it, which it supposeth? Can any reason allow the effect to produce the cause, or any thing to depend upon the consequence of it? No more can Christianity allow the assurance of this truth—I am justified—(supposing it to be true), to be the ground why it is true<sup>j</sup>. And if any man say, that justifying faith is not the assurance of this truth—I am justified, but of this truth—I am predestinate to life (the reason being, because the obedience of Christ, appointed for the salvation of the elect alone, is imputed to him once for all to life, not only for the present to righteousness); can any reason be given, why this reason should not take effect from everlasting, but depend upon the knowledge of it, wherein justifying faith is said to consist<sup>k</sup>? For if the only consideration

book of God?"—Lastly, Rutherford himself, arguing against Saltmarsh the Antinomian: "Wee cannot question Christ more then wee can question whether God be God; but wee may examine Paul's doctrine as the Bereans did: wee may try our own faith if it can hold water" (Christ Dying and Drawing Sinners to Himself, p. 104. Lond. 1647); and p. 110. *ibid.*, "To Antinomians, 1. to be justified by faith, 2. and to come to the sense and knowledge of justification, which either was from eternitie, as some say; or when Christ dyed on the Crosse, as others; or when we first take life in the wombe, as a third sorte dreame: and 3. to be assured of our justification, are all one:" against which doctrine he proceeds to argue. And again (Survey of Antinomianisme, Part II. c. xcii. p. 235. Lond. 1648), "Many weake ones rest upon Christ and so beleve, who cannot come up to an assurance of perswasion they are chosen to life; and have faith, and yet faint and doubt." See Bishop Forbes, Con-

sid. Mod. et Pacif. De Justif. lib. i. c. ii. p. 4; lib. iii. c. ii. pp. 103 sq.

<sup>i</sup> See below, c. xxx. § 10, sq.

<sup>j</sup> "Quid . . . absurdius excogitari potest, quam alicui beneficium dari, si credat sibi beneficium datum fuisse? . . . Animadvertendum est, etiamsi in futurum fides ista respiceret, non solere tamen, nec posse, in beneficiis quæ promittuntur, eam conditionem vel tacite vel expresse unquam apponi, si is videlicet cui promittitur, beneficium istud sibi omnino datum iri credat. Nam si omnino beneficium habiturus est, quid opus est ut rem ita se habere credat? Si non omnino est habiturus, falsum credit." Socin., De Jesu Christi Servat., P. IV. c. iii.; Op., tom. ii. p. 217. a.

<sup>k</sup> "Ubi denique fides, cum ea nihil aliud sit quam firma nostræ in Christo electionis persuasio?" Beza, In 1 Tim. iv. 1.—"Primum quod Deo debes, est, ut credas esse te ab Eo prædestinatum. . . . Qui de hoc dubitat, nec vocatum se nec justificatum credere poterit: hoc est, nequit esse Christianus. Præsu-



that entitles him to the promises of the Gospel be the obedience of Christ, why shall not that right take place from the same date, from which the consideration tendered for it takes place? Why should not the opinion of the Antinomians (at least, that which I make to be ground of that heresy<sup>1</sup>) take place, rather than this of Presbyterians? For both of them being equally destructive to the Gospel of Christ, that which agrees best with itself (the several assumptions whereof are most consistent with, and consequent to, one another), is doubtless the more receivable.

§ 8. Now whether we make justification (granted from everlasting to the elect for whom alone Christ was sent) to go before faith, as the object goes before the knowledge and assurance of it<sup>m</sup>; or whether we make it to depend upon faith (though passed merely in consideration of the obedience of Christ, deputed for the salvation of the elect alone); there will remain no obligation upon the elect to perform any obedience to God, being entitled to and assured of salvation afore it and without it. For the Gospel is the last law of God, derogatory to any declaration of His will antecedent to

[No obligation upon the elect to perform good works, on Presbyterian grounds.]

mendum igitur ut principium fidei nos omnes esse a Deo præscitos, præfinitos, separatos a reliquis, et selectos in hoc ut æternum servemur." Bucer, In Epist. ad Rom., c. viii., c. de Prædestinatione, p. 411. B. C. Basil. 1562. "Justitia enim qua justus sumus coram Deo, non ex temporali hominis actu sed ex æterno Dei decreto pendet; et tum demum revelatur, cum homo credere incipit: ita ut fides hanc justitiam apprehendens, in tempore etiam cum justitia concurret." Sutcliffe, De Cathol. Orthod. et Vera Christi Eccl., lib. ii. c. 6. p. 308. Lond. 1592.—"Meminisse vero debuit vir doctissimus, Deo, 'Qui vocat ea quæ non sunt tanquam sint,' justificatos esse actu ab æterno, in quibus hoc non nisi tempore suo 'revelatum' et 'manifestatum' est." Abbot (Bp. of Salisbury), In R. Thomson, Diatribam Animadv., c. iv. pp. 92, 93. Lond. 1618.—See below, c. xxxi. § 1. sq.

<sup>1</sup> Above, c. i. § 11.

<sup>m</sup> "Fides justificans est instrumentum vel medium per quod remissionem peccatorum consequimur; quocirca causa ejusdem et (ordine naturæ saltem) prior. Deinde, sive dicimus fide

justificante credi peccata esse remissa sive in præsentem remitti, remissio semper fidei objectum statuitur ac proinde natura fidem præcedit... Doleo igitur Daniele Chamierum (ut alios non nominem)... Panstrat. sæ Catholicæ, tom. iii. lib. xiii. De fide, c. 6." (p. 413. 2. E, F. Genev. 1626.) "adeo inconsiderate has ipsas ob rationes affirmare (num. 3) 'fidem justificantem si non tempore saltem ratione sequi justificationem,' et (num. 4) 'fidem non esse causam justificationis.'... Itaque dicit fidem (dicitur fides) 'justificare, non quia efficiat justificationem sed quia efficitur in justificato et requiritur a justificato.' Et rursus in lib. xxii. c. 12, &c." (num. 5. p. 960. 1. F.) "Hæc absurdissima sunt: neque Protestans quisquam sanus et sobrius negaverit fidem esse causam justificationis efficientem, non principalem quidem neque meritoriam sed instrumentalem:... ac proinde justificatione semper ordine naturæ priorem esse. Vid. G. Dounamum, De Fœdere Gratiæ, c. viii. pp. 95, 96." (Dubl. 1631.) Forbes, Consid. Mod. et Pacif., De Justif., lib. i. c. ii. § 4. pp. 4, 5.

BOOK  
II.

it, and not suffering any other to take place further than is provided by it ; so that, supposing that God hath published salvation to the elect merely in consideration of Christ, without requiring any terms at their hands, well may it be said, that notwithstanding He may determine them to do those things which He would have them do that shall be saved ; but it cannot be said, that He can oblige them to any condition to be performed of their free choice ; or, consequently, that there can remain any difference between good and bad in the doings of them, who are free from all obligation to the means because entitled to the end without them. And truly it is more modesty to say, that the actions of the elect, to which God determines them upon these terms, are not good ; than to say (as by consequence it must be said), that the actions of the reprobates are bad ; which, upon these terms, are not their actions but God's, nor imputable to any will of theirs, but to His. But this inconvenience being unavoidable, whether we make justification to depend upon that faith which consists in assuring us of the same (and that is to make an object to depend upon the act which it produceth), or that faith to depend upon it, as included in predestination to life, both of them being destructive to Christianity ; it is but a poor plaster, by contradicting a man's self, to seem to salve so great an inconvenience.

[Nothing  
for it in  
Holy  
Scripture.]

§ 9. And truly it is much to be wondered at, how those that profess nothing but Scripture, could ever persuade themselves of an imagination for which there is nothing to be alleged out of the whole tenor of the Scriptures. Whatsoever can be produced out of the Old Testament for that trust, which the people of God might or ought to have in God for the obtaining of His promises ; whatsoever out of the New, for that peace and security with which Christians may and ought to expect the world to come (supposing, but not granting, all that can be pretended thereby) : do but demand, where it is said, that a man hath this trust, this peace, this security, by having it ; and all will be mute. And, therefore, having shewed that the trust and peace of a Christian supposeth that ground upon which he is justified, I will spend no more words to shew, that the knowledge and assurance of justification or predestination supposes the being of it ; and that, the ground whereupon it takes place.



## CHAPTER VIII.

THE OBJECTION FROM ST. PAUL:—WE ARE NOT JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW NOR BY WORKS, BUT BY GRACE AND BY FAITH. NOT MEANT OF THE GOSPEL, AND THE WORKS THAT SUPPOSE IT. THE QUESTION THAT ST. PAUL SPEAKS TO, IS OF THE LAW OF MOSES AND THE WORKS OF IT. HE SETS THOSE WORKS IN THE SAME RANK WITH THE WORKS OF THE GENTILES BY THE LIGHT OF NATURE. THE CIVIL AND OUTWARD WORKS OF THE LAW MAY BE DONE BY GENTILES. HOW THE LAW IS A PEDAGOGUE TO CHRIST.

THE last reason whereby I prove my intent, consists in the assailing of that objection, which is alleged from the disputes of St. Paul's Epistles; arguing, that a Christian is not justified by the Law, or by the works of the Law, and therefore by grace, and by faith: for he that is justified by engaging himself to profess Christianity, and to live according to the same, must needs be justified by performing his engagement; unless a man would say, that he is justified by making a promise which he never observeth, and which it concerns him not to keep, being once justified by making of it. And, truly, having said, that God admits a man into the state of His grace in consideration of the act of undertaking this profession, I do not only grant, but challenge for my privilege to maintain, that He hold him in the same state in consideration of the act or acts whereby he performs the same.

§ 2. And therefore to the objection, I return this in general:—that I do not grant any man to be justified by any thing that supposes not the Gospel of Christ, since the publishing of it; that is, not by such works as can be done by him, that hath not yet admitted and embraced the Gospel of Christ, and that by virtue of that grace of God, which sets on foot the covenant of grace. For the Law going before the Gospel, and being unable to produce that obedience which God would accept in lieu of the world to come, further than as containing in itself the Gospel and the effects of it; it is manifest, that righteousness cannot be attributed to the Law, nor the works of the Law. And yet, if we consider, that the Gospel itself is a law of God, whereby He ties (at least) Himself to certain terms, upon which He de-

The objection from St. Paul:—we are not justified by the law nor by works, but by grace and by faith.

Not meant of the Gospel and the works that suppose it.

BOOK  
II.

clares that He will be reconciled with His enemies; there is no reason to understand, when St. Paul says that a man is not justified by the Law, or the works of the Law, that he means to deny a Christian to be justified by doing according to the Gospel<sup>a</sup>: which is the law that God pretends to introduce instead of that law, by which the Apostle denies any man to be justified. For all Christianity acknowledges, that the Gospel is implied in the Law; neither could the justification of the fathers before and under the Law, by faith, be maintained otherwise: and, therefore, it is no strange thing to say, that under the Law there were those that obtained that righteousness which the Gospel tendereth, though not by the Law, but by the Gospel; which under the Law, though not published, was yet in force to such as by means of the Law were brought to embrace the secret of it. But it cannot therefore be said, that they were justified by the Law, or by the works of it, but by grace, and by faith; though the Law was a means that God used to bring them to the grace of faith.

[Such works give cause neither for boasting nor despair.]

§ 3. And, therefore, when the Apostle's inferences are employed to fortify this argument;—to wit, that if a Christian be justified by works depending upon the covenant of grace, then he hath whereof he may glory, which Abraham, that was justified by faith, had not; then hath he no means to attain that peace and security which the Gospel tendereth, all having the conscience of such works as do interrupt it;—I do utterly deny both consequences. For I say, that the works that depend upon the Gospel, are neither done

<sup>a</sup> “Quibus sic explicatis, nemo est (ut opinor), qui non videat, opera, quæ oppugnat Paulus, imprimis de operibus in lege Mosaica præscriptis intelligenda esse: quod etiam ab ipso Apostolo nonnunquam exprimitur; nempe, ubicunque fere non *ἔργα* simpliciter sed *ἔργα νόμου* nominat.” Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost., Diss. Post. c. vi. § 8; Works, vol. iii. p. 117.—“Quod superius strictim notavimus, hic fusius a nobis explicandum ac demonstrandum est; sc. fidem, cui justificatio a Paulo tribuitur, pro unica et simplici virtute nequaquam sumendam esse sed integram fœderis Evangelici conditionem denotare, h. e. suo ambitu omnia Christianæ pietatis opera complecti.” Id., ibid., c. iv. § 4;

ibid., pp. 93, 94.—“Summa hæc est: Rejicit a justificatione Apostolus Paulus opera 1. ritualia, . . 2. moralia, quæ natis hominum viribus in statu sive Legis sive meræ naturæ fiunt, ante et citra gratiam Evangelii; 3. Judaica, sive fulem illam justitiam quam docuerunt Judæorum magistri; 4. denique universa, a Christo Mediatore divulsa. . . E contra, opera moralia, ex gratia Evangelii profecta, vi fœderis Evangelici ad æternam hominis justificationem ac salutem efficaciter valere, atque omnino esse necessaria, non tantum non negat Paulus, sed et in eo fere totus est, ut evincat.” Id., ibid., c. xviii. § 2; ibid., pp. 279, 280.



44 without the grace of God, from whence the Gospel comes; CHAP. VIII.  
neither are they available to justify him, whom the Gospel overtakes in sin, of themselves, but by virtue of that grace of God from whence the Gospel comes. Now I challenge the most wilful unreasonable man in the world to say, how he that says this, challenges any thing, whereof he may glory without God; who acknowledges to have received that which he tenders, from God's gift; and the promise which God tenders in lieu of it, from His bounty and goodness: to say, how a man can be more assured, that he is in the state of God's grace, than he can be assured of what himself thinks and does. For (not to decide at present how and how far a man may be assured of God's grace) whatsoever assurance can be attained, must be attained upon the assurance which a man may have of his own heart and actions; and that, as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. ii. 11, "no man knows what is in a man but the spirit of a man that is in him." For if it be said, that this assurance is from the Spirit of God, and therefore supposes not so much as the knowledge of ourselves; I must except peremptorily, that which I premised as a supposition in due place\*, that no man hath the Spirit of God but upon supposition of Christianity: and therefore no man can know that he hath the Spirit of God, but upon supposition that he knows himself to be a good Christian. Otherwise it would be impossible for any man to discern in himself between the dictates of a good and bad spirit; seeing it is manifest, that among those that profess Christianity, many things are imputed to the Spirit of God which are contrary to Christianity. Now of the sincerity of that intention wherewith a man engages to live like a Christian, a man may stand as much assured, as he can stand assured of his own confidence in God, or that he doth indeed believe himself to be predestinate to life. And, therefore, it is no prejudice to that security and peace of conscience which the Gospel tendereth, that it presupposeth this engagement, and the performance of it.

§ 4. This answer, then, proceedeth upon these two presumptions:—that the grace of Christ, which is the grace of God through Christ, is necessary to the having of that faith

\* Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. iii. § 3—8: and above, c. ii. § 7—9.

BOOK II. which alone justifieth; which the heresy of Socinus<sup>p</sup> denies with Pelagius<sup>q</sup>: and that it justifieth not of itself, but by virtue of that grace of Christ, that is, the grace which God declares in consideration of His obedience. These presumptions it is not my purpose to suppose gratis, without debating the grounds upon which they are to be received, having once purposed to resolve wherein the covenant of grace stands. But I must have leave to take them in hand in their respective places<sup>r</sup>, and, for the present, to dispatch that which presses here: which is to shew, that the intent of St. Paul, and the rest of the Scriptures which he expounds most at large, is this,—that a Christian is not justified by the law of Moses, and those works that are done precisely by virtue thereof, not including in it the Gospel of Christ; but by undertaking the profession of Christianity and performing the same (which is, in his language, by faith without the works of the Law), and therefore, consequently, by those works, which are done by virtue of this faith in performance of it<sup>s</sup>.

[State of the question in St. Paul's Epistles.]

§ 5. And, first, I appeal to the state of the question in St. Paul's Epistles, what it is the Apostle intends to evict by all that he disputes; and demand, who can or dare undertake, that he had any occasion to decide that which here is questioned: upon supposition that a Christian is justified by the covenant of grace alone, which the Gospel tendereth; whether by faith alone, which is the assurance of salvation, or trust in God through Christ; or by faith alone, which is the undertaking of Christianity, and living according to the same? For it is evident in the Scriptures of the Apostles, how much ado they had to persuade the Jews who had received Christ, that the Gentiles which had done the like were not bound to keep the Law; which they, it is evident, did keep. These had no ground; had they understood, from the beginning of their Christianity, that their righteousness and salvation depended not upon the keeping of it under the

<sup>p</sup> See below, c. x. § 1, sq.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid.

<sup>s</sup> See above, § 2. note n. "Fides (a Paulo) pro universa quæ evangelio exhibetur obedientia accipitur—(Paulum) loqui de operibus non quibuscunque sed . . . Legis Mosaicæ, contra opera

quoque Legis naturalis—est hæc Paulinæ disputationis summa. Ad hanc normam, quæcunque contra operum justitiam . . . ab ipso dicta occurrunt, exigenda sunt." Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Post., cc. v. vi.; Works, vol. iii. pp. 102. 113. 119.



Gospel of Christ. It is evident, that the trouble which Jewish Christians raised in the Churches, to whom those Epistles  
45 are directed which dispute this point fullest, upon occasion of this difficulty, was the subject and cause of directing the same. What cause then can there be, why these Epistles should prove, that a Christian is not justified by such works as suppose the covenant of grace; whenas the disease they pretend to cure, consists in believing to be justified by the works of Moses' law, which supposeth it not? For it is evident, that had it been received (as now) that Moses' law is void, the occasion of this dispute in these Epistles had ceased; whatever benefit besides might have been procured by them for succeeding ages of the Church.

§ 6. Is it not plain, that the pretence of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans is this, that neither the Gentiles by the law of nature, nor the Jews by the law of Moses, can obtain righteousness, or avoid the judgment of God, and therefore that it is necessary for both to embrace Christianity? He that reads the two first chapters, cannot question this. In the fourteenth chapter, together with the beginning of the fifteenth, you shall find him resolving, upon what terms these two sorts of Christians were to converse with one another; and through the body of it, upon what grounds the Gentiles are invited to the covenant of grace, which the Jews began then to refuse. This being the business of the Epistle, the drift of it is manifest,—whether righteousness and salvation come by the Law or the Gospel, by Judaism or by Christianity.

§ 7. The subject of the Epistle to the Hebrews is this. The Jews, being privileged by the laws of the empire in the exercise of their religion, disclaiming those of their nation that had professed Christianity, found means, by the power of the Romans, to constrain them by persecution to return to

[Argument of the Epistle to the Romans.]

[Of the Epistle to the Hebrews.]

\* “Dicendum, occasionem hujus ad Romanos Epistolæ scribendæ natam fuisse ex contentione, quæ Romæ inter Judæos et gentiles, utrosque fideles, suborta fuerat de meritis et justificatione; dum scilicet utrique suis meritis evangelii gratiam arrogarent. . . . Est autem hæc vera ac germana de justificatione doctrina: non quæ opera nos-

tra a negotio justificationis simpliciter excludat, ut sectarii volunt (siquidem et ipsa fides opus quoddam nostrum est); sed quæ a justificatione removeat opera sive Legis sive naturæ, fidem præcedentia, et omnino ea quæ non sunt ex fide.” Estius, Comment., in Proleg. ad Epist. ad Rom., pp. 1, 2. Paris. 1623.

BOOK  
II.

Judaism<sup>u</sup>. The question is, whether they can obtain salvation, turning Jews again; which they persuade themselves they might obtain, being such before they embrace Christianity. That this is the question, let him that will take the pains to compare the proposition of it in the beginning of the second chapter, and the reasons which it is pursued with until the sixth, with the conclusion of the dispute in the thirteenth (considering also that discourse which follows, of the intent and effect of the Law),—let him, I say, give sentence<sup>x</sup>. If he refuse me, I will be bold to say of him, that no man is so blind as he that will not see.

[c. xiii. v.  
9.]  
[c. xiii. vv.  
10—15.]

[Of the  
Epistle to  
the Gala-  
tians.]

§ 8. With the Churches of Galatia, when St. Paul writ to them, the case was somewhat otherwise. It is manifest, that they consisted partly of Gentiles, partly of Jews. The words of the Apostle require it; Gal. iv. 8, 9: “But then truly, not knowing God, ye served those which indeed are no gods; but now, having known God, or rather being known of God, how turn ye back to those weak and beggarly elements, to

<sup>u</sup> “Occasio scribendæ hujus Epistolæ . . . gemina erat; Hebræorum, tum 1. vitium, error, et negligentia, in studio Legis et Evangelii (Heb. v. 11, 12), tum 2. status seu conditio; periculum ab infidelibus Judæis fidem opugnantis, partim dolo falsæ doctrinæ (Heb. xiii. 9), partim vi persecutionis” (Heb. x. 34; xii. 4). Gomar, ap. Poli Synops. in Proleg. ad Epist. ad Heb. That this epistle was addressed to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Judæa (the “Hebrews” of Acts vi. 1), see Estius, Comment., in Proleg. ad Epist. ad Heb., pp. 900, 901: and so also J. D. Michaelis.

<sup>x</sup> “Apostolus in hac Epistola . . . (ad Hebræos) partim docet quæ Christi dignitas et quod officium, quæque sacerdotii Ejus et sacrificii supra Leviticum excellentia: partim vero consolatur Hebræos et ad perseverantiam fidei in Christum hortatur; utpote propter Christi fidem variis modis afflictos ab infidelibus et adversariis Judæis. Et quidem hoc posterius esse proprium hujus Epistolæ argumentum arbitrantur expositores Græci. . . Verum si spectemus exordium Epistolæ totumque progressum, facile apparebit Apostolum in hac Epistola principaliter intendere doctrinam. . . Id agit . . . ut ostendat quo loco (Jesus Christus) ab

eis (Judæis) sit habendus, quod Ejus officium, et quale sacerdotium: quo nimirum constituto sacerdotium vetus cum suis sacrificiis omnino cessare jam debeat. Erant enim Judæi Moysi et cæremoniis Legis ita addicti, ut quamvis Jesum pro Messia recepissent, a Lege tamen abduci se non paterentur, sed eam cum Evangelio miscerent: a Christo quidem exempla virtutum petentes ac præmia suæ justitiæ expectantes; ipsam vero justitiam Legi ac cæremoniis, remissionem autem peccatorum sacrificiis expiatoriis eadem Lege præscriptis, attribuentes. In quo errore destruendo, non hic tantum verum etiam alibi sæpe, sed maxime Epistolis ad Romanos et Galatas, occupatur: quibus perinde cum hac Epistola magna est argumenti affinitas. Harum enim trium Epistolarum unus generalis scopus est, docere veram justitiam non ex Lege sed a Christo per fidem esse petendam. Cæterum id docent secundum diversas partes Legis. Nam Epistola ad Romanos ex Lege morali, id est, Decalogo, justificari hominem negat: epistola ad Galatas justificandi vim removet a cæremoniis. Hæc vero Epistola peculiariter id ipsum de sacrificiis antiquæ Legis, quæ cæremoniarum pars erant præcipua, demonstrat.” Estius, Comment., ad Epist. ad Heb., p. 899.



which ye desire to be in bondage again?" For neither could they serve those that were not gods indeed, unless Gentiles; nor unless Jews, return to those elements<sup>y</sup>. It is manifest, that, to avoid persecution for the profession of Christianity, those whom St. Paul writes against, would have them be circumcised; and so, conform themselves so far to the Law, that those who raised that persecution might be satisfied at their hands. "Those that would make a fair show in the flesh, constrain you to be circumcised, only that they may not be persecuted with the cross of Christ: for neither themselves that are circumcised, do keep the Law; but would have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh:" saith St. Paul, Gal. vi. 12, 13. And again, Gal. v. 11: "But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? for then the scandal of the cross is void." And is not the question then between the Law and the Gospel, between Judaism and Christianity, whether of them entitles to salvation and righteousness<sup>z</sup>? And shall the excluding of the Law exclude those works which suppose Christianity, or rather include whatever the Gospel includes or infers?

§ 9. Consider what opinion the Jews had then entertained, The question that

<sup>y</sup> "Atqui Galatæ non ex Judaismo sed ex Paganismo vocati fuerant ad Evangelium, a quo veluti pedem referentes ad Judaismum regrediebantur; quum contra oportuerit eos ad metam progredi. . . Hoc non considerarunt Græca præsertim scholia, quæ putant nomine elementorum mundi significari elementa quibus hic mundus constat itemque lunam et solem et sidera, ex quorum cursu metiti menses, tempora, et annos, Galatæ ad pristinam idololatriam essent reversi. Id vero absurdum est quam ut refutatione indigeat: Beza, ad Gal. iv. 9.—"Cæterum ex hoc loco apparet etiam idola et idololatriæ cultus ceremonias 'elementorum mundi' nomine comprehendi: dicens enim Apostolus, 'iterum convertimini ad elementa,' significare videtur et illa priora, quibus servierant Galatæ, elementa fuisse, quamvis Judaicis elementis similia. . . Forte etiam quispiam referat hanc iterationem ad Judæos fideles qui erant inter Galatas. Nam et in Galaticam regionem dispersos fuisse Judæos, constat ex 1 Epist. Petri cap. 1.

Verum ex textu manifestum est Paulum eos compellere qui dudum idolis servierant, iis inquam 'qui natura non sunt Dii:' eosdemque reprehenderet quod 'iterum converterentur ad infirma et egena elementa.'" Estius ad Gal. iv. 10.—On either interpretation therefore of the expression, "weak and beggarly elements," Thorndike's inference is avoided, that the Epistle is addressed to Jewish converts as well as Gentile.

<sup>z</sup> "Convenit argumentum hujus Epistolæ (ad Galatas) cum ea quæ ad Romanos scripta est, quod in utraque doceat apostolus, non ex Lege et cæremoniis, sed ex fide Christi, hominem justificari. Verum hoc interest, quod ad Roman. scribens intentionem magis dirigat contra opera Legis qua parte moralis est; in quibus adversus gentiles gloriabantur Judæi: hic vero præcipue contra cæremonias, ad quarum observationem a pseudapostolis Galatæ (qui Gentiles erant) urgebantur." Estius, Comment., in Proleg. ad Epist. ad Gal., p. 533.

BOOK  
II.

St. Paul  
speaks to,  
is of the  
Law of  
Moses and  
the works  
of it.

to alienate them from Christianity then, and to divide them from it ever since. So long as the nation stood, it is manifest, how much ado there was to hold them to the worship of the true God; which was the ground of that law by which they held the land of promise. Being carried to Babylon, and seeing the menaces of the Law come to pass, and revolving within themselves those things, which Isaiah and other prophets had preached against the worship of idols, <sup>46</sup> (upon that occasion it seems, but certain it is) they never departed from the worship of one true God afterward. But then, with the study of His law, after their return from captivity, came in a curiosity of learning and keeping all punctilios, which the observation of it could require; as supposing the wisdom of the nation, which the Law itself magnifieth, Deut. iv. 6—8, together with their righteousness and holiness, to consist in these niceties: whereas this was indeed but the civil and outward observation of those precepts, of the external worship of one God, and civil conversation among themselves, to which the civil happiness of the land of promise was tied; as I shewed in the first Book<sup>a</sup>. Hereupon our Lord to His disciples, Matt. v. 20; “Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.” And again, to shew that the disease began long afore, though then it was come to the height, He reproves His hearers with those words which the prophet Esay had charged upon his time (Isa. xxix. 13); “In vain they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the traditions of men;” Matt. xv. 9; Mark vii. 7: where He instanceth in the washing of cups and pots according to the Law, of brass vessels, and beds, of the hands before meat and after they came from market, according to the tradition of the elders; which the Apostle, 1 Pet. i. 18, calls their “vain conversation delivered from their fathers.” This is manifestly that righteousness whereof St. Paul says, Rom. x. 3, that the Jews, “not knowing the righteousness of God, and willing to establish their own righteousness, were not subject to God’s righteousness.” For as it is evident, that not to be subject to the righteousness of God is neither more nor less than to refuse the Gos-

<sup>a</sup> Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., cc. xii. § 5, sq.: xiii. § 1, sq.



pel of Christ; so their own righteousness, which they would establish in opposition to the same, must needs be that righteousness which they might be possessed of by virtue of the Law. And indeed it is not possible to imagine, that the Jews should so punctually and superstitiously reverence all those nice observations, traditions, and customs, which the Scribes and Pharisees brought in to limit the generality of Moses' law, and to determine every clause, circumstance, and tittle, according to which it should be observed (which now that vast bulk of their Talmud<sup>b</sup> contains); if they did not think, that true wisdom and righteousness before God is placed in the nice keeping of these curiosities. Nor can it be doubted, that the undervaluing of them, by reason of Christianity, is that which first occasioned them to take offence at the Gospel, and to this day maintains them in contradiction to it.

§ 10. It can therefore by no means be doubted, that this is the law, and therefore the works, which S. Paul means, when he argues, that we are not justified by the Law, nor the works of the Law, but by grace and faith. For it is most manifest, that he instances divers times in those precepts which are not of the law of nature. Nor can the works of them be counted to belong to the inward obedience of God, and His worship in spirit and truth: but merely forms, which God had tied them up to His service with, that they might have no occasion to seek after strange gods; and customs, whereby He had so limited their civil conversation to one another, that being divided thereby from other nations, they might have no occasion to learn their gods. So St. Paul, Gal. iv. 9, 10: "But now having known God, or rather being known of God, how turn ye back again to those weak and beggarly rudiments, to which ye desire to be in bondage again? ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years." For the observation of legal festivals, according to the months and seasons of the years, is indeed

<sup>b</sup> Surenhusius's translation of the Mischna, with the commentary of Maimonides and others (Amst. 1698), is in six folio volumes. The commentary called the Babylonish Talmud (which is the Talmud properly so called), runs in the

Amsterdam edition (1752—1765) to twelve folios, and the Jerusalem Talmud adds one more to the number. The original Mischna itself occupies but a single octavo volume as printed at Amsterdam in 1631.

BOOK  
II.

obedience to that God, by whose law the difference is made. But when their conceit of themselves transports them to imagine, that God esteems them for those things, whereby He hath differenced them from other nations, and that it cannot stand with that esteem, that He should receive the Gentiles into favour upon undertaking that spiritual obedience which Christ publisheth, not tying that to the same; worthily are they called by the Apostle "weak and beggarly rudiments," that did only prepare them to this obedience, by tying them<sup>47</sup> to the true God and His outward service. And is not the precept of circumcision, in the first place, which obliges to all the precepts and entitles to all the promises, of this nature? Hear St. Paul to the Philippians (iii. 3—6), among whom this leaven began to spread: "We are the circumcision," saith he, "that serve God in the spirit, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh: though I have confidence in the flesh also: if any other man seem to have confidence in the flesh, I more; circumcised the eighth day, of the race of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of Hebrews, also concerning the Law a Pharisee, as concerning zeal one that persecuted the Church, as concerning righteousness that is by the Law, blameless." Are not all these privileges of that nation by virtue of Moses' law, and of circumcision, which obliges to it? And is not that confidence of righteousness which is by the Law, which St. Paul disclaims (though he claim as good a title to it as any Jew beside),—I say, is not that it which moved the Jews, out of zeal to the Law, to persecute the Church? And can that righteousness which moveth to persecute Christianity, be thought to presuppose it? Therefore, what St. Paul means by confidence in the flesh, we must learn from the Epistle to the Hebrews, ix. 9, 10: where the tabernacle is called a "parable" or "figure for the then present time; in which gifts and sacrifices were offered, which could not profit him that ministered as to conscience, being only imposed upon meats and drinks, and several baptisms, and righteousnesses of the flesh, until the time of reformation came." Where "*δικαιώματα σαρκὸς*" are those carnal and bodily rites, which obtain that carnal righteousness, which answereth the carnal and earthly promises of the Law; and were mistaken by them for



means of obtaining resurrection unto life, and the world to come, which under the Law so given they had nevertheless just cause to expect, though not in consideration of such observations. CHAP. VIII.

§ 11. Another argument hereof we have from St. Paul, which to me seems peremptory: in that he opposeth that grace and faith, whereby Christians are justified, to those works, which Gentiles by the law and light of nature were able to do; which works, certainly, do not suppose Christianity. Eph. ii. 8, 9: "For by grace are ye saved through the faith; and that not of yourselves, it is God's gift; not of works, lest any man should glory." There is nothing more manifest, than that the Church of the Ephesians, when St. Paul wrote this Epistle, was gathered of those that had been Gentiles; as you may see by Eph. ii. 11, 12; iii. 1, 6. Wherefore, when St. Paul says to them, being presently Christians, that they were not saved by works, lest they should glory; it is manifest, that his meaning is, that their conversation before the Gospel came, could not move and oblige God to provide them the means of salvation which it tendereth. Again, St. Paul, exhorting Timothy to suffer hardship for the Gospel, according to the power of God, Who (saith he) "hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose, and the grace that is given us in Christ Jesus before everlasting ages" (2 Tim. i. 9), speaketh of the same Ephesians; whose pastor Timothy was at that time. But most fully, Titus iii. 4—7: "But when the goodness and love to men of God our Saviour appeared, not of works which we had done in righteousness saved He us, but according to His own mercy, by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed upon us richly through our Saviour Jesus Christ, that being justified by His grace we might become heirs of everlasting life according to hope." For that those whom Titus had in charge were Christians converted for the most part of Gentiles, appears by the Apostle's words, Titus i. 10, [11]: "For there be many, and those rebellious, vain talkers and cheaters, especially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped." And in the words that go next afore the passage alleged, there is a He sets those works in the same rank with the works of the Gentiles by the light of nature.

BOOK II. lively description of the conversation of the Gentiles : for of Jews he could not have said, "we also were once foolish, disobedient, wandering out of the way, enslaved to divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another;" Titus iii. 3. Seeing then that it concerns the Gentiles as well as the Jews, which the Apostle argues, that men are not justified by works, but by grace<sup>48</sup> and by faith; it is manifest, that he means such works as the Gentiles might pretend to no less than the Jews; and that, while they were Gentiles, because he speaks of that estate in which the Gospel overtook them. And therefore, when St. Paul denies that men are justified by works, he means those works which men are able to do before they are acquainted with the preaching of the Gospel, whether by the light and law of nature, or by the mere instruction of Moses' law.

The civil and outward works of the Law may be done by Gentiles.

§ 12. For though the law of Moses contain in it many moral precepts of true and inward and spiritual obedience, the observation whereof is indeed the worship of God in spirit and in truth; yet we must consider, that the same precepts are part of the law of nature, written in the hearts even of Gentiles. And we must consider further, that these precepts may be obeyed and done two several ways: first, as far as the outward work, and the kind and object of it, goes: and, further, as far as the reason of it, derived from the will and command of God, and the intention thereof directed to His honour and service; which purpose of heart cannot be in any man but him that loves God above this world, making Him the utmost end of all his actions. I say then, that of those moral precepts of Moses' law, which are parts of the law of nature, the outward and bodily observation goes no further than the observation of other ritual and civil precepts of the same law; and, therefore, is to be comprised in the account of those works of the Law, by which St. Paul denies deservedly that we are justified before God. But the inward and spiritual observation of them (at least, the purpose and intention of it), as it depends upon the grace of Christ, which the Gospel publisheth, so must it necessarily be included in that faith, which, in opposition to the works of the Law, qualifies Christians for those promises which the Gospel tendereth.



§ 13. But that which must remove all doubt of the Apostle's meaning in this point, must be the removing that difficulty, which held the Jews then (and still holds them) in the opinion of obtaining righteousness and salvation by the Law. For, certainly, could St. Paul have persuaded them, that the ancient fathers from the beginning (of whose salvation they could not doubt), though under the Law, yet obtained not salvation by the Law but by the Gospel, it had been an easy thing for him to have persuaded them to it. The Apostle's intent therefore is, to persuade them to that, which because it was hard to persuade them to, therefore they continued Jews, and refused to become Christians. Now let us suppose that which I have premised,—that the Law expressly covenanteth only for the worldly happiness of that people in the land of promise, requiring, in lieu of it, only the outward and civil observation of the Law. But, the sum of that outward observation thereof, which is expressly covenanted for, consisting in the worship of one God (Whose providence in the particular actions of His creatures it presupposeth, maintaining also a tradition of the immortality of man's soul, and of bringing all men's actions to account), shall not all that are born under this law, stand necessarily convict, that they owe this God that inward and spiritual obedience, wherein His worship in spirit and truth consisteth? And seeing the same God tenders them terms of that reconciliation and friendship, which maintains them in that state of this world, whereby they may be able and fit to render Him such inward and spiritual obedience, punctually making good the same to them; have they not reason enough to conclude, that they shall not fail of His favour and grace, so long as they proceed in a course of such obedience? How much more, having the examples of the ancient fathers, the doctrine which they delivered by word of mouth, the instructions of the prophets (whom God raised up from time to time, to assure them, that this was the principal intent of God's law, though it made the least noise in it),—how much more, I say, must they needs stand convict, both of their own obligation to tender  
 49 God this obedience, and also that, tendering it, they could not fail of God's favour toward them, even as to the life to come.

BOOK  
II.[The Gos-  
pel implied  
and veiled  
in the  
Law.]

§ 14. Though this cannot be said to be the Gospel of Christ, because it containeth not the dispensation of His life in the flesh, nor the express tender of the life to come, in consideration of the profession of His name and of living according to His doctrine; yet, if it be truly said, that the Gospel is implied and veiled in the Law<sup>c</sup>, either this signifies nothing, or this is the thing that it signifies. For upon this ground it is manifest, that there was always a twofold sense and effect of Moses' law, and, by consequence, a twofold law. By virtue of which difference, whereas it is said (Heb. vii. 16) that the legal priesthood stood "by the law of a carnal precept," and the precepts thereof are called "*δικαιώματα σαρκὸς*" (as I said afore), and the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of the red heifer, are said to "sanctify to the cleansing of the flesh" (Heb. ix. 10, 13): on the other side, St. Paul saith, that "the Law is spiritual," and that "the commandment was given to life," and therefore discovers "concupiscence" to be "sin;" Rom. vii. 7, 10, 14: and St. Stephen saith to his people of Moses, that he "received living oracles to give unto us," Acts vii. 38; and St. Paul of himself and his fellow Apostles, delivering the doctrine of the Gospel; "Which things we speak," saith he, "not with words taught by man's wisdom, but taught by the Holy Ghost, comparing spiritual things with spiritual things;" 1 Cor. ii. 13: that is, the spiritual things which the Gospel expresseth, with the same spiritual things implied by the Law. As I shewed afore<sup>d</sup>, that the same St. Paul's meaning is, that "the man of God" is "perfectly furnished to every good work," when he is able to make the Scriptures of the Old Testament useful, to instruct, reprove, teach, and comfort Christians in Christianity: 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. And, truly, whatsoever is said in the writings of the Apostles, or the sayings of our Lord Christ (supposing the difference between that which is spiritual and that which is carnal or literal in the Scriptures), must be expounded upon this ground of the Apostle, that "all the promises of God are yea in Christ, and in Him Amen;" as St. Paul saith, 2 Cor. i. 20: that is to say, that the temporal promises of Moses' law were in-

<sup>c</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. v. § 33. note b.<sup>d</sup> Ibid., § 26.



tended for, and fulfilled in, the eternal promises of Christ's Gospel. For, upon this ground, there is a "Jew according to the letter," and a "Jew according to the spirit;" that is, a Christian: Rom. ii. 28, 29. There are "sons according to the flesh," and "sons according to promise:" Rom. ix. 8. And, "He that was born of the bondmaid, was born according to the flesh," and "persecuted him" that was born of the free woman "according to the spirit:" Gal. iv. 23, 29. For this reason it is said, that "the fathers all eat the same spiritual meat, and drank the same spiritual drink," as we Christians do; "for they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, which rock was Christ;" 1 Cor. x. 3, 4: because, as Christianity was intended by the Law, so was Christ by the figures of the Law. Neither is there any other reason to be given, why "the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth" (as St. Paul affirmeth, 2 Cor. iii. 6), but this; because, as the Law in the literal sense provides no remedy for those that fall into capital crimes, but leaves them to the justice of the law; so the spiritual sense of it was not available to bring men to life, though available to convict them of sin: so that the Jews (whom St. Paul pursueth as guilty of sin by the conviction of the Law) stand nevertheless convict, that they were never able, however convict of sin, to attain righteousness by the help of it alone; and, therefore, that they are no less obliged to have recourse to the Gospel, and to embrace Christianity, than the Gentiles themselves, who had no other pretence to avoid the judgment of God which the Gospel publisheth.

§ 15. This is the intent of St. Paul in the first chapters of his Epistle to the Romans: which he recapitulates in this general inference, Rom. iii. 9, "We have pleaded before, that Jews and Gentiles both are under sin;" and again, Rom. xi. 32, "God hath shut up all under disobedience, that He might have mercy on all." And out of the same consideration he argues, Gal. iii. 10, 13, that "as many as are of the works of the Law are accursed; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them:" and again, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one

[The Law  
ineffectual  
to salvation  
without the  
Gospel.]

BOOK  
II.

that hangeth on a tree." For though the Law provided remedies for many transgressions, the use whereof might and did restore men to the benefit of those temporal promises, which it tendered; yet, inasmuch as there was no remedy against capital transgressions by the Law (inasmuch as no remedy against death, which is the punishment allotted to the transgression of God's original law), in so much it is justly said, that by the Law there was sufficient conviction of that spiritual death, to which those that retired not themselves under the spiritual law of God were necessarily liable: though that spiritual law were never published, till Christ by submitting to the literal curse of the Law had established the same<sup>e</sup>.

How the  
Law is a  
pedagogue  
to Christ.

§ 16. To this purpose truly saith St. Paul, Gal. iii. 18, 19, that "the inheritance" being "allowed Abraham by promise," the Law was "added because of transgressions:" that is, because there was no relying upon the good nature of that people (whose benefit the promises made to Abraham did concern); that, because they professed the true God and acknowledged His providence and judgment to come, therefore, without constraint of temporal punishments, they would abstain even from those sins whereby civil society is violated. And therefore the Apostle addeth, that God "hath concluded all under sin, that the promise might be given those that believe, by the faith of Jesus Christ; but, before the faith came," saith he, "we were guarded by the Law, as shut up to the faith which was to be revealed; so that the Law is our pedagogue to bring us to Christ, that we may be justified by faith." The office of a pedagogue in St. Paul's sense, according to the custom of those times, is not that which most men understand; as I said afore<sup>f</sup>. A pedagogue is not the master of a

[Gal. iii.  
22—24.]

<sup>e</sup> See below, c. xxvii. § 4. And compare Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Post., c. viii. § 7—9; Works, vol. iii. pp. 139—141. Also in his Exam. Cens., Resp. ad Animadv. xix. § 6, *ibid.*, p. 253: "'Concludi sub peccato,' sive peccatis involvi, is dicitur, qui peccati reatu adhuc obstrictus tenetur; ita sub peccato conclusi in conspectu Dei erant omnes ante Christum, si legem Mosaicam per se respicias; quippe quæ (ut modo dixit Apostolus) nullam veram justificationem quæ cum vitæ sive hæ-

reditatis cœlestis donatione conjuncta esset, præstiterit: hoc beneficium ex promisso, credentibus dato in Jesum Christum, promanavit. Illa vero promissio ante Legem obscurius facta, et sub Lege velata, tandem in Evangelio apertissime revelata fuit. Summa est, Vere justificabantur pii etiam *sub Lege*, sed non *per Legem*, sed 'per gratiam Domini Nostri Jesu Christi,' Act. xv. 11."

<sup>f</sup> Above, c. iv. § 13.



school, but a governor, such as fathers then appointed their sons (out of their slaves for the most part, in whose discretion they had some confidence, to trust their children with them), for the conducting of them to school, and for the overseeing of them when they were dismissed by their masters again. So that, when he saith "the Law is our pedagogue to bring us" to school "to Christ," the sense is most fit and proper according to my intent;—that, discovering the conviction of sin by the punishments wherewith it guardeth and shutteth men up from offending, it leadeth us to the engagement which Christ requireth of us, that we offend no more. And upon this ground and to this effect it is, that St. Paul infers out of the passages of the Old Testament which he had there premised, Rom. iii. 19—21: "What the Law saith, it saith to those that are under the Law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty to God, that no flesh should be justified before Him by the works of the Law; for by the Law is the knowledge of sin; but now the righteousness of God is manifested without the Law, being testified by the Law and the Prophets." For how is the righteousness of God witnessed by the Law (which ministereth conviction of sin) and by the Prophets; but in regard the Law affords sufficient arguments of the truth of the Gospel, by which that righteousness which God accepteth to everlasting life is tendered; and because the Prophets, succeeding the Law, do clear and publish the same more and more. And again, Rom. iv. 15, 16: "For the Law worketh wrath; because, where there is no Law, there is no transgression: therefore of faith" (is the promise), "that it may be according to grace; that the promise may be firm to all the seed, not only that which is of the Law, but that also which is of the faith of Abraham, which is the father of us all." For if there be a twofold seed of Abraham, one according to the Law only, which worketh wrath, the other according to the promise; then is there also a twofold law: because that promise infers a law of God, by virtue whereof those that are of faith are justified by the promise. Now, if the restraining of that people from gross offences by those punishments which the Law threatened them with, were a considerable means to prepare that people to sub

BOOK  
II.

selves to the Gospel when it should come to be preached; it will necessarily follow, that during the time that the Law was 51 to stand, it was appointed by God, to bring them to true spiritual righteousness: Who, apprehending the secrets of their own hearts open to God (Whom the Law ties them to acknowledge) and liable to His judgments, in confidence of the goodness which He prevented them with, should engage the resolution of their hearts to worship Him in spirit and in truth.

[Double  
sense of  
the word  
law.]

§ 17. Seeing then, that all the arguments, whereby the Law and the Prophets do bear witness to the truth of Christianity, are grounded upon the correspondence between the temporal promises of the Law and the spiritual and everlasting promises of the Gospel (whereupon follows the correspondence between that carnal obedience which the Law, and that spiritual obedience which the Gospel, requireth); it followeth necessarily, that though there was then no express publication of any will of God, to be engaged to give life everlasting to those, that should take upon them to yield Him that inward and spiritual obedience, which the Gospel now covenanteth for, yet, notwithstanding, this will of His, darkly intimated by the dispensation of the Law, was effectual to make those that embraced those intimations to yield Him such obedience: and yet the number of them so slender, as made the coming of Christ, and His Gospel, no less necessary to the salvation of the Jews than of the Gentiles. And this is that equivocation of the word law, which Origen, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans 5, and in his Phi-

§ Origen, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom., lib. iv. c. 5: Op., tom. iv. p. 529. 2. B. ed. Bened. (it exists only in the Latin): "De diversitate autem legum, quod in hac præcipue Epistola sæpe Apostolus etiam latenter et subito ab alia ad aliam legem sermonis ordinem mutat, frequenter ostendimus, et eadem iterare superfluum est." And see the several passages referred to in the Benedictine index under the word Lex; and especially lib. vi. c. 8. p. 581, and the Benedictine note there. And note h below. And above, c. v. § 10, note h.—"Ex hoc testimonio" (S. Athanasii) "apparet veteres sensisse, 1°. Vocabulum  $\delta$  νόμος apud Paulum  $\delta$ μωρβ-μος sive alia atque alia significatione usurpari. 2°. Bifariam omnino legem

accipi in Paulinis Epistolis; nempe juxta literam et juxta Spiritum; hoc est, quatenus ipsum erat Evangelium sub veteribus figuris delitescens et ceremoniarum velis obtectum. . . (Tertiam illam legis  $\sigma$ χέσις, qua scil. fœdus operum ab Evangelio distinctum . . . denotet, penitus ignorarunt Patres optimi.) . . 3°. Elogia illa omnia quæ Legi tribuuntur, nempe quod sit *spiritualis, sancta*, &c., ipsi competere, quatenus juxta Spiritum sive pro ipso Evangelio accipitur. 4°. Quoties Paulus Legi justificationem detrahit, Legem intelligi juxta literam." Bp. Bull, Exam. Cens., Resp. ad Animadv. xix. § 10; Works, vol. iv. pp. 259, 260: and see the Harm. Apost., Diss. Post. c. viii. § 8; *ibid.*, pp. 140, 141.



localia<sup>b</sup>, oftentimes complains to be the occasion of the obscurity of that and other of St. Paul's epistles. The same, in a word, which made the Jews stumble at the counsel of God in voiding that law, to which He had brought them up, and so well accepted their zeal for it. Only this we must take along with us, that whatsoever is here said to be intimated by the Law, and made good under it, concerning the reward of everlasting life to the inward obedience of God's spiritual law, is to be understood, by virtue of those promises upon which the Gospel is established; which the fathers from the beginning were bred up in the expectation of, according to that of the Apostle, Heb. xi. 13, 16: "These all died according to faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and being persuaded, and having saluted them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims upon earth: for they who say such things, declare that they seek a country; and had they been mindful of that which they were come out from, they might have had time to turn back; but now they desire a better, that is, an heavenly: whereupon God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He had prepared them a city." And again, 39, 40: "These all, being witnessed by faith, received not the promises; God having provided some better thing for us, that they might not be perfected without us." Where it is plain, that they, according to the Apostle, expected the kingdom of heaven by virtue of that promise, which is now manifested and tendered and made good by the Gospel: whereof our Saviour saith, John viii. 56, "Your father Abraham leaped to see My day, and saw it and rejoiced;" and again, Matt. xiii. 17,

<sup>b</sup> "Τὸ οὖν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; οὐχ ὥσπερ ὄνομα ἐν ἔστι νόμος, οὕτω καὶ εἰς ὁ περὶ νόμου πανταχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς λόγος. διὰ καὶ ἕκαστον χρὴ τύπον αὐτῆς ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιστήσαντα θεωρῆσαι, νῦν μὲν τί σημαίνεται ἐκ τοῦ νόμου φωνῆς, νῦν δὲ τί χρὴ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐννοεῖν. . . . τῇ τοίνυν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ φανερούμεν ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρεῖ μὲν οὐδαμῶς ὁ τῆς φύσεως νόμος; μικρότερος γὰρ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς; ὁ δὲ Μωσέως νόμος, οὐ τὸ γράμμα ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ ἀνάλογον τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νόμου προφῆται, καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνευματικοὶ λόγοι." κ.τ.λ. Philocal. c. ix. pp. 88, 93. 4to. Paris, 1618. The passage is given at length in

the note to the Bened. edition of Origen, tom. iv. p. 581: and see Bp. Bull, Exam. Cens., Resp. ad Anim. i. § 3; Works, vol. iv. p. 10. The Philocalia is a collection of passages "de obscuris S. Scripturæ locis, a SS. PP. Basilio Magno et Gregorio Theologo ex variis Origenis Commentariis excerpta;" and the one here cited is referred by the Benedict. edition to the Commentary on the Epist. to the Romans, lib. vi. c. 8, as cited in the last note; Rufinus's Latin translation of that Commentary (in which form only it is preserved) being proved here to be a very unfaithful abridgment.

BOOK II. "Verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men have desired to see the things ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear the things ye hear, and have not heard them."

## CHAPTER IX.

52

OF THE FAITH AND JUSTIFICATION OF ABRAHAM AND THE PATRIARCHS, ACCORDING TO THE APOSTLES. OF THE PROPHETS AND RIGHTEOUS MEN UNDER THE LAW. ABRAHAM AND RAHAB THE HARLOT JUSTIFIED BY WORKS, IF JUSTIFIED BY FAITH. THE PROMISES OF THE GOSPEL DEPEND UPON WORKS WHICH THE GOSPEL ENJOINETH. THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH.

Of the faith and justification of Abraham and the patriarchs, according to the Apostles.

HAVING thus shewed, that the interest of Christianity, and the grounds whereupon it is to be maintained against the Jews, require this answer to be returned to the objection, it remains that I shew, how the Apostles' disputations upon this point do signify the same. Of Abraham then, and of the patriarchs, thus we read, Heb. xi. 8—10: "By faith Abraham obeyed the calling to go forth unto the place he was to receive for inheritance, and went forth not knowing whither he went; by faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as none of his own, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him of the same promise; for he expected a city having foundations, the architect and builder whereof is God." Is it not manifest here, that both parts of the comparison are wrapped up in the same words? which cannot be unfolded but by saying, that as Abraham, in confidence of God's promise to give his posterity the land of Canaan, left his country to live a stranger in it, so, while he was so doing, he lived a pilgrim in this world, out of the faith that he had conceived out of God's promises, that he should thereby obtain the world to come. And is not this the profession of Christians, which the Apostle, in the words alleged even now, declareth to be signified by the pilgrimages of the patriarchs? And is not this a just account, why they cannot be said to have attained the promises by the Law but by faith?

[Sarah.]

[Heb. xi. 11, 12.]

§ 2. Therefore that which followeth immediately of Sarah, must needs be understood to the same purpose;—"By faith



Sarah also herself received force to give seed, and bare beside the time of her age, because she thought Him faithful that had promised; therefore of one, and him mortified, were born as the stars of heaven for multitude, and as the sand that is by the sea shore innumerable." For St. Paul declareth, Gal. iii. 16; iv. 22; Rom. ix. 7—9; that the seed promised Abraham, in which all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, is Christ, and the Church of true spiritual Israelites, that should impart the promise of everlasting life to all nations. And this promise you saw even now, that Abraham and the patriarchs expected. Sarah therefore, being embarked in Abraham's pilgrimage, as by the same faith with him she brought forth all Israel according to the flesh, so must it needs be understood, that she was accepted of God as righteous in consideration of that faith, wherewith she travailed to the world to come.

§ 3. Neither can it be imagined, that St. Paul's dispute of the righteousness of Abraham by faith can be understood upon any other ground or to any other effect than this. "What then shall we say that Abraham our father got according to the flesh?" saith he, Rom. iv. 1—5: "for if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not towards God: for what saith the Scripture? Abraham 'believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness:' but to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned according to grace but according to debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the wicked, his faith is imputed for righteousness." The question, "what Abraham found according to the flesh?" can signify nothing, but what got he by the Law (which is called the flesh in opposition to the Gospel included in it, which is called the spirit). Did he come by his righteousness through the Law or not? For had Abraham been justified by works that should need none of that grace which the Gospel tendereth for remission of sins, well might he glory of his own righteousness; and not otherwise. For he that  
53 acknowledges to stand in need of pardon and grace, cannot stand upon his own righteousness. Now Abraham cannot so glory towards God; because the Scripture saith, that "his faith was imputed to him for righteousness:" which

**BOOK II.** signifies God's grace in accepting of it to his account, not his claim as of debt.

[David.] § 4. Whereupon the Apostle inferreth immediately the testimony of David, writing under the Law, in these words:

[Rom. iv. 7, 8.] "As David also pronounceth the man blessed to whom God imputeth righteousness without works; 'Blessed are they whose iniquities are remitted, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sin.'" What can be more manifest, to shew that the Apostle intends no more, than that the fathers pretended not to be justified by those works, which claimed no benefit of that grace which the Gospel publisheth? Especially, the consequence of David's words being this; Psalm xxxii. 2; "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sin, and in whose spirit there is no guile." For the prophet David including the spiritual righteousness of the heart in the quality of him to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works, the Apostle must be thought to include it in the faith of him to whom the Lord imputeth it for righteousness.

[Abraham's faith included works.] § 5. Now when St. Paul observeth in Moses, that "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness," upon the promise of that posterity which he expected not, Gen. xv. 6; it cannot be said, that Abraham had not this faith afore; or that it was not "imputed to him for righteousness" till now: because the Apostle to the Hebrews hath said expressly that he had the same faith, and to the like effect, ever since he left his country to travail after God's promises. And, certainly, it was but an act of the same faith, to walk after the rest of those promises, whereby it should please God further to declare the purpose for which He brought him from home. That faith therefore, which was imputed for righteousness to Abraham (not as the Jews challenge righteousness by doing the Law, but as Christians expect it, by remission of sins), includes in it an engagement of travelling that way that God points out to the land of promise; upon the account whereof that faith, which was imputed to the patriarchs for righteousness, proceedeth.

[And came by God's free pro-] § 6. Now when St. Paul proceedeth further to argue, that this imputation of Abraham's faith to righteousness came to pass while he was yet uncircumcised, and no way subject to



the Law; and that by virtue of God's promise (which proceeded upon consideration of this righteousness), and not of the Law, the title of his inheritance stood (which promise he argueth further, Gal. iii. 17, 18, that the Law, coming four hundred and thirty years after, could nothing derogate from): I challenge all the world to say, how all this infers any more, but that the righteousness of Abraham comes not by virtue of the Law (by doing whereof the Jews pretend righteousness), but by God's free promise, whereby Christians expect remission of sins.

§ 7. To the same effect, therefore, St. Paul concludes, Rom. iv. 23, 24: "But it was not written because of him alone, that it was imputed to him; but because of us, who believe in Him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead, to whom it is to be imputed." For the example of Abraham's faith in the promise of God to give him such a posterity by Sarah, and that it was imputed to him for that righteousness whereby he became qualified for the promises upon which he left his country, is written for the instruction of Christians upon this account; because, so sure as we believe that the New Testament was intended by the Old, so certain we are, that the faith whereby we undertake to follow God, and the way to the world to come, which He by Christ points us out, qualifies us for the same. But he that will have St. Paul upon these reasons to infer, that Christians are justified by believing that they are predestinate, or by trusting in God, not supposing that trust grounded upon that obligation which our baptism professeth; in plain terms, he makes St. Paul use arguments that do not conclude. For if Abraham cannot brag of his righteousness before God, because of God's account, not of debt; if David count happiness not to stand upon any title of purchase, but by remission of sins; if faith were reckoned to Abraham for righteousness before he was  
54 circumcised; if the inheritance were due by virtue of God's promise: then that righteousness which entitles Christians to the world to come, stands by virtue of the Gospel (which publisheth remission of sins to all whom it overtakes in unrighteousness), and by God's grace (in accepting their undertaking of Christianity, and living according to it, as qualifying them for everlasting life); not by doing the Law, without

BOOK  
II.

having recourse to that means which the Gospel tendereth for remission of sins, and right to the world to come. But it is in vain to infer from any of those assumptions, Therefore Christians are justified by that faith in which no obligation of bearing Christ's cross or any consideration thereof is included.

[Of the  
faith and  
justifica-  
tion of  
Moses.]

§ 8. With this which hath been said of that faith whereby Abraham was justified, let us compare that which follows of the faith of Moses; Heb. xi. 24—26: "By faith Moses, growing great, refused to be called Pharaoh's daughter's son; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a time, counting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; because he looked upon the reward to be rendered." The faith by which Moses was justified consists in this, that he renounced his quality in the court of Egypt that he might have a share in the promises made to God's people. And this the Apostle justly calls undertaking the reproach of Christ: because it was the same thing in effect to the people of God then, as now is the bearing of Christ's cross, which Christians at their baptism profess; and because the promises which the fathers looked after, are fulfilled in Christ; as I shewed afore.

[Of  
Enoch.]

§ 9. And herewith let us compare the faith of Enoch, Heb. xi. 5, 6: "By faith Enoch was translated not to see death, and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he is witnessed to have pleased God; but without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and that He rewardeth those that seek Him." Well may we conclude from hence, that Enoch was not justified by the Law, nor by the works of it, but by that persuasion upon which he sought God; as Christians, by obliging themselves so to do, not by that faith, which includeth not nor supposeth any resolution and obligation so to do.

Of the  
prophets  
and right-  
eous men  
under the  
Law.

§ 10. Compare now herewith the conclusion of the whole dispute, concerning the righteous men and prophets under the Law, Heb. xi. 32—38: "And what shall I say more? for the time will fail me to tell of Gideon, and Barak, and Sampson, and Jephthah, and David, and Samuel, and the prophets: who by faith conquered kingdoms, wrought righteous-



ness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the force of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, recovered of weakness, became strong in war, put to flight armies of strangers; women received their dead raised to life again; others were tortured to death, not expecting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection; others had trial of mockings and scourgings, and, besides, of bonds and imprisonment; were stoned, sawn asunder, tempted, died slain by the sword, went about in sheep's and goats' skins, in want, afflicted, distressed, . . . wandering in deserts, and mountains, and caves and holes of the earth." Will this conclude, that all these were justified by that faith, which neither includeth nor presupposeth a resolution and obligation to righteousness; who, out of the hope of God's promises to His people, acted against the enemies thereof, or suffered for righteousness, the same things, in that state of God's people, which Christians now suffer and do for the profession of Christ's cross, into which they are baptized? In fine, the whole dispute of the Apostle here, and of St. Paul in so many of his Epistles, concerning faith, and the righteousness that Christians have by it, is the same with that which the fathers of the Church maintained against the Jews, that Christianity is more ancient than Judaism<sup>1</sup>: that, as the fathers before the Law obtained not that right (which both Christians and Jews allow them) to the promises of the world to come by the works of the Law, so the prophets and righteous men under the Law had not that hope by doing it, but by the assurance which under the dispensation of the Law they had conceived (as of reason they ought), that God would not fail them in  
55 the world to come, that should heartily and faithfully serve Him in this: which (adding to it the profession of the Name and warrant of Christ, as the Author of that contract, whereby we undertake so to do) is Christianity.

§ 11. I have yet said nothing of the passage of St. James, ii. 14—[26], where he disputes expressly, that faith alone justifieth not, but faith with works; for it seems to make a general argument by itself; though, in truth, the reason which he brings that Abraham was justified by works, necessarily depends upon the true reason why St. Paul saith, that Abra-

[How faith  
includes  
works.]

<sup>1</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Tr., c. xii. § 12, note n: and below, cc. xvii. § 17, xix. § 3, 20.

BOOK  
II.

ham was justified by faith: which reason they that will not admit, deserve to crucify themselves everlastingly, to find, how he can be truly said to be justified by works, that is justified by faith alone without works afore; were it not pity, that the Scriptures should be set on the rack to make them confess a meaning, which the words in no language, by any custom of human speech, will bear. For if the faith of him that hath no good works, will not save him, nor justify him, as the Apostle expressly affirmeth, can the works that are said to do this, be said to do it metonymically—because they are signs or effects of faith which doeth it, when it is said that faith without them doth it not? And though by the way of metonymy the property or effect of the cause may be attributed to the effect of that cause, yet, when that property or effect is denied the cause, and attributed to the effect, will any language endure, that it should be thought properly to belong to the cause which is denied it, and attributed to the effect only by metonymy, that is, in behalf of the cause that is denied it? Is there any need to come into these straits, when, by saying that a man is justified by faith alone according to St. Paul (meaning by faith<sup>j</sup>, undertaking Christianity), a man will be obliged to say, that he is justified by works also, according to St. James (to wit, by performing that which he undertaketh); unless you will have him justified by undertaking that which he performs not. For when it is said, that a man is justified by undertaking Christianity, it is supposed, that he undertakes it sincerely and heartily; which sincerity, containing a resolution of all righteousness for the future, justly qualifies him for those promises which overtake him in sin: so that, for the present, he can have nothing to justify him but the righteousness of this faith alone, which the Gospel tells us that God accepteth; but, for the time to come, just ground is there to distinguish a second justification<sup>k</sup> (which proceeds upon the same consideration, but supposes the condition undertaken to be performed) from that first, which, though done by faith alone, inferreth the necessity of making good what is undertaken, that it may be available. Is not this that the Apostle

<sup>j</sup> The word "faith" is added from the MS.

<sup>k</sup> So Bellarm., *De Justif.*, lib. iv. c. xviii.; *Controv.*, tom. iii. p. 1227. C.

But see Bp. Bull, *Harm. Apost.*, Diss. Post., c. iii. § 1—3; *Works*, vol. iii. pp. 88—90.



saith, James ii. 15—17: "If a brother or sister be naked or want daily food, and one of you say to him, Go in peace, be warmed and fed, and yet give them not things fit for his body, what is he the better? so also faith, if it have not works, is of itself dead." Where lies this comparison but in this, that he who professeth Christianity, but doth not according to it, is like him that professeth love to his brother, but relieves not his necessities? And so, when it follows, "But a man may say, Thou hast faith and I have works; shew me thy works by thy faith, and I will shew thee my faith by my works." For he that liveth like a Christian, it is plain he sheweth his faith by his works, which is evidence that he professeth Christianity sincerely; but he that only professeth, is yet to make evidence by his works, that his profession is sincere.

§ 12. As for the example of Abraham, the Apostle's words are these: "Abraham our father, was he not justified by works, when he offered Isaac upon the altar? thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith perfected; and the Scripture which saith, Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness, was fulfilled, and he was called the son of God." What is this, but that which we read, 1 Mac. ii. 52; "Was not Abraham found faithful in trial, and it was counted to him for righteousness?" For it was "counted to him for righteousness," that, "not being weak in faith, he considered not his own body already mortified, as being a hundred years old, nor the mortification of Sarah's womb, nor doubted through want of  
56 belief in God's promise, but was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God, and being satisfied that He is able to do what He hath promised:" as St. Paul saith, Rom. iv. 19—21. And, therefore, much more must it needs be "counted to him for righteousness," that "by faith he offered Isaac when he was tempted, and that he who had received the promises offered his only-begotten son, of whom it had been said, 'In Isaac shall posterity be counted to thee;' reckoning that God was able to raise him from the dead; whence also he received him in a parable:" as the Apostle saith, Heb. xi. 17—19. For here, as I shewed afore, it is the act of faith, and not the object of it, that is imputed to righteousness;

CHAP.  
IX.["to them"  
—"αὐ-  
τοῖς."][James ii.  
18.]Abraham  
justified by  
works if  
justified by  
faith.[James ii.  
21—23.]["φίλος  
Θεοῦ."]

BOOK  
II.[James ii.  
22.][James ii.  
23.—Gen.  
xv. 6.]And Ra-  
hab the  
harlot.[James ii.  
25.]The pro-  
mises of  
the Gos-  
pel depend  
upon works  
which the  
Gospel en-  
joineth.

and in that obedience whereby this temptation was overcome, though there was a good work, yet there was an act of that faith; and therefore the Apostle deservedly addeth, that his "faith wrought with his works:" but the faith that moved him to travail after God's promise, was perfected by this work, wherein that faith moved him to tender God obedience. And, therefore, "the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness;" because that which Moses had said, that God counted Abraham righteous for his faith, was made good, and proved not to have been said without cause, but that he was righteous indeed (as righteous he must be, whom God so accounts), that obeyed God in such a trial as this.

§ 13. So that which St. James addeth of Rahab,—“Like-wise Rahab also the harlot, was she not justified by works, receiving the messengers and sending them out another way?”—how shall it agree with that of the other Apostle, Heb. xi. 31,—“Through faith Rahab the harlot perished not with the unbelievers, receiving the spies in peace;”—but by virtue of the same reason, that having conceived assurance of the promises of God to His people, that she might have her share in them, she resolved to become one of them upon such terms as the case required; wherein certainly the preservation of their spies was required. So, if by faith, then by works; if by works, then by faith.

§ 14. I must not leave this point, till I have produced another sort of Scriptures, in which the promises of the Gospel are made to depend upon works which Christianity requireth: as, namely, when forgiveness of sins is promised upon condition that we forgive our brethren their offences against us. Matt. vi. 14, 15, our Lord rendering a reason why He had taught His disciples to pray, “Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us:”—“For if ye forgive men their sins, your heavenly Father will forgive you also; but if you forgive not men their transgressions, neither will your Father forgive your transgressions.” And the Apostle, James ii. 13, to the same purpose; “Judgment shall be without mercy to him that sheweth not mercy.” And the foot of our Saviour's parable, Matt. xviii. 35: “So also shall your heavenly Father do to you, if from your hearts



ye forgive not every one his brother their transgressions." So Mark xi. 25, 26. And Luke vi. 37, 38: "Judge not and ye shall not be judged, condemn not and ye shall not be condemned, pardon and ye shall be pardoned; give and there shall be given to you; good measure, crowded and shaken and running over, shall be given into your bosom; for the measure that ye mete with, shall be measured to you again." And again, Luke xi. 41: "But give alms according to your power, and all things shall be clean to you." So Solomon, Prov. xvi. 6; "By mercy and truth shall iniquity be expiated." And Daniel to Nebuchodonosor, Dan. [iv. 27<sup>1</sup>]: "Re- deem thy sins by righteousness" (or "alms-deeds"), "and thy iniquity by shewing compassion upon the afflicted." For the verb פרוק can signify nothing but 'redeem' in the Chaldee: though there is a figure of speech in the prophet's language, intending, "redeem thyself from thy sins," as I shall have occasion to say in another place; and therefore it is in the Greek, "*τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι*."<sup>m</sup> And from hence come those sayings, Tobit iv. 10; "Ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐὰν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ σκότος;" and again, Tobit xii. 9; "Ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, καὶ αὐτὴ ἀποκαθαίρει πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν:"—"Alms delivereth from death, and suffereth not to enter into darkness;" and, "Alms delivereth from death, and purgeth away all sin." And Eccus. iii. 30; "Water quencheth flaming fire, and with alms shall he make propitiation for sins." And 57 xxix. 12; "Shut up alms in thy store houses, and they will deliver thee from all afflictions." And the words of the Apostle are plainest in this sense, 1 Pet. iv. 8: "Charity

[Dan. iv.  
24. LXX.  
Heb. and  
Vulg.]

[αὕτη ἀπο-  
καθαρίει.]

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Thorndike as from iii. 57 (misprinted 5). See below, c. xxvii. § 11.

<sup>m</sup> "Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor." Eng. Vers.—"Peccata tua eleemosynis redime, et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum." Sic versio vulgata, secuta LXX interpretes, qui vocem Hebraicam צדקה per ἐλεημοσύνη (ex orientali nimirum idiomate) reddiderunt." Bp. Bull, Harm. Apost. Diss. Prior, c. ii. § 7; Works, vol. iii. pp. 22, 23; adding in a note, "פרק Chaldæum respondet Hebræo פרה; vide 2 Sam. iv. 9; Num. iii. 49,

et xviii. 15: recte ergo Theodotion vertit λύτρωσαι: vide Grot. in locum."—"פרק Chaldæum respondet Hebræo פרה, quod hic in interpretatione posuit Iacchiades. Apparet id 2 Sam. iv. 9, Esai. xxxv. 9, Num. iii. 49, xviii. 15, et alibi sæpe. Quare optime vertit Theodotion λύτρωσαι [redime]. Neque offendere quemquam debet quod operibus pœnitentiæ, in quibus excellunt ἐλεημοσύναι [eleemosynæ, id est, misericordiæ opera], tribuatur id quod pœnitentiæ propriè convenit: est enim talis μετανομή [transnominatio] aut συνεκδοχή [comprehensio] per frequens." Grot., ad Dan. iv. 24. See below, c. xxvii. § 11.

BOOK  
II.

shall cover a many sins." The prophet also to the same purpose, Isai. i. 17. For they that make that faith which alone justifieth not to include or presuppose that condition, to which baptism tieth Christians, must needs crucify themselves, and set the Scriptures upon the rack, to find another meaning for them than the words bear; by which that, which God hath made due without and before any condition, may truly be said to be given in consideration of it: which reason and the common sense of all men abhors. But supposing that faith which only justifieth to include the profession of undertaking Christianity, as the condition upon which the promises of the Gospel are to be expected; so certain as it is, that this will not be due if the condition be not fulfilled, so necessary and so proper it will be to say, that whatsoever that condition includeth, is the consideration upon which the promise cometh; though not by virtue of the thing done, but by virtue of God's tender, and the covenant of grace, and the promise which it containeth, and the free goodness of God which first moved Him to tender that promise. And therefore you shall find those, that suppose it not, always tormenting themselves, to force upon the Scriptures such a meaning as the words of them do not bear.

The tradi-  
tion of the  
Church.

§ 15. And, in the last place, concerning the consent of the Church: though the fathers are free in acknowledging with St. Paul justification by faith alone, yet notwithstanding they are, on the other side, so copious in attributing the promises of the Gospel to the good works of Christians, that it may truly be said, there is never a one of them from whom sufficient authority is not to be had for evidence thereof: which will amount to a tradition of the whole Church in this point. In particular, St. Augustin (to whom appeal is wont to be made in all parts of that dispute which relateth to the heresy of Pelagius) hath so clearly and so copiously delivered the answer which I maintain, to those texts of St. Paul, where he denieth that Christians are justified by the works of the Law<sup>n</sup>; that those that challenge him in other points of this

<sup>n</sup> "Sensus autem verborum Pauli ex mente Augustini et eorum qui mentem ipsius melius calluerunt, . . . longe diversus est. Excludit enim Paulus a nostra justificatione opera facta ex sola

notitia legis sine Spiritu gratiæ intus moventis, et inquit ex his non justificari hominem." Vazquez, in Prim. Secund. S. Thom. Aquin., Disput. cciii. c. vii. p. 659. (Ingoldst. 1612), who



dispute concerning the covenant of grace, do not pretend to be of his mind in this°. Though the ground of this answer, consisting in the twofold sense of the Law, deserved (as I conceive) to be further cleared, even after St. Augustin and the rest of ancient Church writers.

CHAP.  
IX.

§ 16. I would therefore have the reader here to understand, that I account all the rest of this second Book to be nothing else but the resolution of those difficulties, the answer to those objections and demands, which arise upon the determination here advanced. The chief of them is that which follows in the next place; how the promises of the Gospel can be said to be the effects of God's free grace, requiring our Christianity as the condition upon which they become due and not otherwise. But there are also others,—concerning the possibility of fulfilling God's law by the new obedience of Christians, concerning the goodness and perfection of it, concerning the force and effect of good works, either in making satisfaction for sin, or in meriting life everlasting,—which I shall allow that consideration, in due time<sup>p</sup>, which the model of this abridgment will bear.

§ 17. As for the sense of the fathers, evidencing the tradition of the Church, I am yet to learn that there ever was any exception alleged to infringe the consent of the Church in the necessity of good works to the obtaining of salvation for Christians; but only the case of those, who being taken away by death upon professing Christianity, have not time to

[Unanimous to the necessity of good works in order to salvation.]

proves his position at length in Disp. ccx. c. viii. pp. 750 sq.—“Quapropter non sunt sibi contrariæ duorum Apostolorum sententiæ Pauli et Jacobi, cum dicit unus justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, et alius dicit inanem esse fidem sine operibus; quia ille dicit *de operibus quæ fidem præcedunt*, iste de iis quæ fidem sequuntur.” S. Aug., Lib. lxxxiii. Quæst., Qu. 76. § 2; Op., tom. vi. p. 68. F.—“Quomodo ergo justificabitur homo per fidem sine operibus? Respondet ipse Apostolus: Propterea hoc tibi dixi, o homo, ne quasi de operibus tuis præsumere videreris, et merito operum tuorum te accepisse fidei gratiam. Noli ergo præsumere *de operibus ante fidem*. Noveris quia peccatorem te fides invenit, et si te fides data facit justum, impium invenit quem faceret justum. Credenti, inquit, in Eum qui justificat impium,

deputatur fides ejus ad justitiam. Si justificatur impius, ex impio fit justus.” Id., In Ps. xxxi. Enarr. ii. § 6; Op., tom. iv. p. 174. C, D.—And see below, § 19. notes x. y. a—f.

° “Augustine and the rest of the fathers that dispute against Pelagius, doe take ‘justice’ for an inherent sanctitie or new obedience; . . . and to ‘justifie,’ for to make one from unjust, just. But indeed they hold with us, that this new obedience is not in this life perfected,” &c. Perkins, Demonstr. of Probl., § on Justific.; Works, vol. ii. p. 607. I. D.—And so also Bp. Downham, Treat. of Justif., lib. iv. c. vii. § 9. pp. 254, 255. Lond. 1633.—See below c. xxx. § 24, 26; and Bp. Bull, Apol. pro Harm., sect. iv. § 12; Works, vol. iv. p. 364.

<sup>p</sup> Below, cc. xxxii. xxxiii.

BOOK II. bring forth the fruits of it. And how good works can be the necessary means to procure the salvation of Christians, but by virtue of that law or condition for obtaining salvation which the Gospel now expressly enacteth, and always did covertly effectuate, no sense of man comprehendeth. For that the ancient Church agreeth in allowing the force of satisfaction for sin to works of penance, of merit for the world to come to works done in the state of grace<sup>a</sup>, none of the Reformation (which either disowneth or excuseth it for 58 so doing, according to the respect they have for it) can make questionable. And, therefore, though this be not the place to justify the ancient Church in these particulars, yet this is evident, that those who maintain more than my position requires, do agree in that which it contains. I shall therefore content myself for the present with producing some special passages of the fathers, expressing (in my opinion) the marks of my position, and the reasons whereupon it proceeds: as limiting the position between faith and works, in the matter of justifying, to those works which go before faith (that is, before baptism) and are done without faith, not to those that issue upon it; and, therefore, placing that faith which alone justifieth, in the profession of Christianity by baptism; and that justification which ensueth upon it, not in effecting that faith, but in those rights which God alloweth him that hath it upon the account of it.

[St. Jerome.]

[“jacentur”]

[“dicuntur”]

[Hagg. i. 6.]

[“calefiant”]

§ 18. St. Jerome upon that of Zach. viii. 10, “There was no reward for man or beast:”—“*Præusquam fidem Christi quis recipiat, et in eo Spiritus Sancti fundamenta radican- tur, nullus audire poterit, ‘Est merces operi tuo:’ sive ille Judæus sit, sive hæreticus, sive gentilis; quicquid boni operis fecerit, nisi in Christi nomine fecerit, mercedem sui [boni] operis non habebit: videmus hæreticorum virgines, philosophorum rigorem, Judæorum in escarum varietate observantiam; et tamen dicimus, juxta Aggæum, ‘quod comedant et non satientur, bibant et non inebriantur, operiantur et non caleant, et qui mercedem congregat, mittat eas in sacculum pertusum’*”—“Before a man receive the faith of Christ, and the foundations of the Holy Ghost be laid in him, no man shall be able to hear, ‘There is a reward for thy work:’ be he Jew, or heretic, or Gentile, whatsoever good work he shall do, not doing it in the name

<sup>a</sup> See below, c. xxxiii.: and Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., cc. ix. xi.



of Christ, he shall have no reward for his work: we see the virgins of heretics, the rigour of philosophers, the scrupulosity of Jews in diversities of meats; and yet we say according to Aggai, 'They eat and are not filled, they drink and are not merry, they are clothed and not warmed, and he that gathers wages puts them into a purse with a hole in it<sup>r</sup>.'—Upon Galat. iii. 2: "*Consideremus autem diligenter, quia non dixerit, [‘volo a vobis discere’] utrum ex operibus Spiritum accepistis, sed adjecerit ‘ex operibus Legis;’ sciebat enim et Cornelium centurionem Spiritum ex operibus accepisse, sed non ex operibus Legis, quam nesciebat: si enim e contrario dicatur, ergo et sine eruditione fidei accipi Spiritus Sanctus potest, nos respondemus accepisse quidem eum Spiritum, sed ex auditu fidei, et naturali lege, quæ loquitur in cordibus nostris bona quæque facienda et vitanda mala, per quam dudum quoque Abraham, Moses, et cæteros sanctos justificatos retulimus, quam augere deinceps potest operum observatio, Legis quoque notitia, non tamen carnalis legis quæ præteriit, sed spiritualis, quia lex spiritualis est: neque vero quia fidem præferimus, Legis opera destruimus, aut dicimus, secundum quosdam, ‘Faciamus mala donec eveniant bona, quorum damnatio justa est;’ sed servituti gratiam anteponimus, dicimusque, quod Judei propter metum faciunt, id nos facere propter charitatem; [illos servos esse, nos filios;] illos cogi ad bonum, nos bonum sponte suscipere: non igitur ex fide Christi licentia nascitur delinquendi, sed ex dilectione fidei voluntas boni operis augetur, dum bona ideo facimus, non quia judicem formidamus, sed quia scimus Ei placere in Quem credimus*"—"Now let us diligently consider, that he saith not, 'Whether have ye received the Spirit by works,' but addeth, 'by the works of the Law;' for he knew, that even Cornelius the centurion received the Spirit by works, but not by the works of the Law, which he knew not: for if it be said on the other side, that then the Holy Spirit may also be received without the hearing of faith; we will answer, that he received the Spirit, but by the hearing of faith, and the law of nature, which says in our hearts that all good is to be done and evil avoided, whereby we told you afore that Abraham and Moses and the rest of the saints were justified;

CHAP.  
IX.

[“au-  
tem”]

[“Legis  
quoque  
justitia”]

[“nec di-  
cimus”]  
[Rom. iii.  
8. “veniant  
bona”]

<sup>r</sup> St. Jerome, In Zach. Proph. cap. viii.; Op., tom. iii. p. 1749. ed. Bened. The slight inaccuracies in this and the

following quotations are corrected in the notes or margin.

BOOK  
II.

which the observation of works succeeding may increase, and knowledge of the Law, but not the carnal law which is past, but the spiritual, because the Law is spiritual: nor do we destroy the works of the Law, because we prefer faith, or say, according to some, 'Let us do evil till good come, whose damnation is just;' but we prefer grace before bondage, and say, that we do for love that which Jews do for fear; that they are constrained to that good which we do of our own accord: 59 therefore there rises no licence to sin from the faith of Christ, but from the law of faith the lust of well doing increaseth, while we do good, not because we are afraid of the Judge, but because we know it pleases Him in Whom we believe." Here the difference which I make between works, and works of the Law, is St. Jerome's. Here the righteousness of the fathers under the law of nature is ascribed to faith, out of which they submitted themselves to it; as also Cornelius his title to that grace of the Holy Ghost which the Gospel promiseth. Here the reason is set forth, why the works of the Law justify not; because the preaching of the Gospel supposeth, that the Law can effect no more than an outward and carnal obedience to the precepts thereof, for fear of punishment: whereby it appeareth, that those works which justify not, are not only those of the ceremonial law, but all that goes before the preaching of faith, whether as under Christianity, or as before it, according to St. Jerome; the Gospel both requiring and effecting that inward and spiritual obedience, which love constraineth. I am not afraid, after this, to name the short commentary upon St. Paul's Epistles, which usually goeth with St. Jerome's works; though I will suppose it to be Pelagius his:—upon Gal. iii. 10: "*Quæritur sane hoc loco, si fides sola sufficiat Christiano, et utrum non sit maledictus qui præcepta evangelica contemnit: sed fides ad hoc proficit, ut in primitiis credulitatis accedentes ad Deum justificet, si deinceps in justificatione permaneat*" (lege, permanent); "*cæterum sine operibus fidei, non Legis, mortua est fides: qui enim non credunt mandatis, et qui precepta evangelica contemnunt, maledictos esse et Servator edocuit, dicens, 'Discedite a me maledicti in ignem æternum;' et Jacobus Apostolus unius mandati transgressorem omnium reum esse ostendit*"—"Here, forsooth, it is questionable, whether faith

[“credit”]

[Matt. xxiv. 41.]

[James ii. 10.]

[“demonstravit”]

<sup>s</sup> St. Jerome, In Epist. ad Gal. cap. iii. ; Op., tom. iv. P. i. pp. 249, 250.



alone be enough for a Christian, and whether he be not accursed, that shall neglect the precepts of the Gospel: but faith availeth so far, as in the beginning of belief to justify those that come to God, if they abide in justification thenceforth; but without the works of faith, not of the Law, faith is dead: for that those who believe not the commandments, and neglect the precepts of the Gospel, are accursed, even our Saviour hath taught, saying, 'Go ye cursed from Me into everlasting fire;' and the Apostle James sheweth, that he who transgresseth one commandment is guilty of all<sup>t</sup>." Again, upon 1 Tim. ii. 15: "*Notandum quod sola fides [ad salutem] ei, qui post baptismum supervixerit, non sufficiat, nisi sanctitatem mentis et corporis habeat, quæ sine sobrietate difficile custoditur*"—"It is to be noted, that faith alone is not enough for him that survives after baptism, unless he have the holiness both of mind and body, which without sobriety is hardly preserved<sup>a</sup>." Here you have St. Jerome's distinction between the works of faith and of the Law, and baptism the boundary of righteousness by faith alone without the works of faith.

§ 19. And if any man be so impertinent as to suspect [St. Augustin.] St. Jerome for a Pelagian, wherein he agrees with Pelagius, St. Augustin may persuade him, that Pelagius is no Pelagian in this, but speaks the sense of the Church.—Serm. lxxi. *De Tempore*. "*Quomodo fides per dilectionem operatur? Et quomodo justificatur homo per fidem absque operibus Legis?*" ["sine"] "*Quomodo, intendite fratres. Cred[id]it aliquis, percepit fidei sacramenta in lecto, et mortuus est. Defuit illi operandi tempus. Quid dicimus? Quia non est justificatus? Plane dicimus justificatum, 'credentem in Eum Qui justificat impium.' Ergo rite justificatus est, et operatus non est; [et] impletur sententia Apostoli dicentis, 'Arbitramur justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus Legis.' Latro, qui cum Domino crucifixus est, 'corde credidit ad justitiam, ore confessus est ad salutem.' Nam 'fides quæ per dilectionem operatur,' etsi non sit in quo exterius operetur, in corde tamen illa fervens servatur. Nam erant quidam*

<sup>t</sup> In Append. ad Op. S. Hieron., tom. v. p. 1040. ed. Bened.; where the reading is "permaneat." These Commentaries are identified by Vossius with those which Pelagius is known to have written: but asserted on the contrary

by Abp. Ussher to have been subsequently compiled from those of Pelagius, St. Jerome, and Primasius. See Cave, Hist. Litt., tom. i. pp. 382, 383.

<sup>a</sup> Id., ibid., p. 1088.

[Rom. iv. 5.]

[Rom. iii. 28.]

[Rom. x. 10.]

[Gal. v. 6.]

BOOK  
II.[“jam  
qui”]

*in Lege qui de operibus Legis gloriabantur, quæ fortasse non dilectione sed timore faciebant, et volebant se justos videri, et præponi gentibus quæ opus Legis non fecerant. Apostolus autem, prædicans fidem gentibus, cum eos qui accedebant ad Dominum videret justificatos ex fide (ut jam quia crediderant bene operarentur, non quia bene operati sunt credere mererentur), exclamavit securus, et ait, ‘Quia potest justificari homo ex fide sine operibus Legis;’ ut illi magis non fuerint justî, qui quod faciebant timore faciebant. Cum fides per dilectionem operetur in corde, etiamsi foras non exit in opere.”*—“How 63 works faith by love? And how is a man justified by faith without the works of the Law? Brethren, mark how. A man believes, receives the sacraments of faith in his bed, and dies, wants time of working. What shall we say? That he is not justified? Plainly we say he is justified, ‘believing in Him That justifies the wicked.’ So he is justified but wrought not. The saying of the Apostle is fulfilled, ‘I suppose a man is justified by faith without the works of the Law.’ The thief that was crucified with our Lord, ‘believed with the heart to righteousness, and confessed to salvation with the mouth.’ For ‘faith that worketh by love,’ when there is nothing to work upon outwardly, remains nevertheless fervent in the heart. For there were those under the Law that boasted of the works of the Law, which perhaps they did not for love but for fear, and would seem righteous, and be preferred before Gentiles, that had not done the works of the Law. But the Apostle, preaching the faith to the Gentiles, and seeing those who come to the Lord justified by faith (so that they did well because they had believed, and not merited to believe by well doing), cries out securely and says, that ‘a man may be justified by faith without the works of the Law.’ So that they who did what they did for fear of the Law, rather were not righteous; whereas faith may work by love in the heart, though it go not forth in any work \*.”—Again, *Libro Quæstionum lxxxiii. quæst. lxxvi. : “Si quis cum crediderit, mox de hac vita discesserit, justificatio fidei manet cum illo; non præsentibus bonis operibus, quia non merito ad illam sed gratia pervenit; nec consequentibus, quia in hac vita esse non sinitur”*

[“nec præ-  
cedenti-  
bus bo-  
nis”]

\* S. Aug., Op., tom. v. pp. 9. E—G, Scripturis. De Tempore Serm. lxxii. 10. A; Serm. ii. § 9. inter Serm. de (not. lxxi.), in older editions.



—"If a man depart out of this life straight after he hath believed, the justification by faith remaineth with him; good works neither accompanying, because he came not to it by merit but by grace, nor following, because he is not suffered to live<sup>y</sup>."—(The reason being the same, for which those who depart without baptism, if not by their own fault, are held to be saved: in regard whereof St. Bernard Epist. lxxvii. thinks, that the Gospel, Mark xvi. 16, having said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," doth not repeat, 'He that is not baptized shall be damned,' but only, "He that believeth not shall be damned<sup>z</sup>.")—Here the only case in which a Christian can be saved without good works, is, when time obliges him not to bring them forth. And the only reason why the works of the Law justify not, is, because the spiritual obedience of the Law presupposeth faith; the knowledge of the Law according to the letter reaching only to produce the outward work, without that inward disposition, which only Christianity effecteth, as well as requireth: a thing which St. Augustin, in the dispute with Pelagius, so often repeateth. *De Spiritu et Litera*, cap. viii.<sup>a</sup> and xxix.<sup>b</sup> *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*, [lib.] iii. [§] 2, 7<sup>c</sup>. *De Gratia Christi et Peccato Originali*, i. 13<sup>d</sup>; ii. 24<sup>e</sup>. *De Gratia et Lib. Arbitrio*, cap. xii.<sup>f</sup>

§ 20. Origen, in *Rom.* iii. libro iii.: "*Indulgentia namque non futurorum sed preteritorum criminum datur; igitur, ut ad propositum redeamus, justificatur homo per fidem, cui ad justificationem nihil conferunt opera Legis: ubi vero fides non est, quæ credentem justificet, etiamsi quis opera habeat ex Lege, tamen quia non sunt ædificata supra fundamentum fidei, quamvis videantur esse bona, operatorem suum justificare non pos-*

<sup>y</sup> S. Aug., Op., tom. vi. p. 67. F, G.  
<sup>z</sup> S. Bernard., Tract. ad Hug. de S. Victore, de Baptismo, c. ii. § 8. (Epist. lxxvii. in older editions); Op., tom. ii. p. 635. A, B. ed. Bened.: "Vide etiam ne forte ob hoc Salvator cum diceret, 'Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit,' caute et vigilanter non repetierit, Qui vero baptizatus non fuerit; sed tantum, 'Qui vero,' inquit, 'non crediderit, condemnabitur:' nimirum innuens solam interdum fidem sufficere ad salutem et sine ipsa sufficere nihil."

<sup>a</sup> S. Aug., De Spir. et Lit., c. viii. § 15; Op., tom. x. pp. 92. E—G, 93. A—C.

<sup>b</sup> Id., ibid., c. xxix. § 50, 51; ibid., pp. 112. E—114. B.

<sup>c</sup> Id., ibid., pp. 447. B—E, 451. C—E.

<sup>d</sup> Id., De Gratia Christi, lib. i. c. xiii. § 14; ibid., pp. 236. G, 237. A, B.

<sup>e</sup> Id., De Peccato Origin., lib. ii. cc. xxiv, xxv. § 28, 29; ibid., pp. 265. A—266. D.

<sup>f</sup> Id., De Gratia et Lib. Arb., c. xiii. § 25; ibid., p. 731. A—D.

BOOK II. *sunt, si eis deest fides, quæ est signaculum eorum qui justificantur a Deo*—"For faith granteth indulgence of sins past, not to come; he therefore is justified by faith, to return to our purpose, to whose justification works of the Law contribute nothing: but where that faith which justifieth him that believeth, is not, though a man have works according to the Law, yet, because they are not built upon the foundation of faith, though they seem good, they cannot justify their workers; wanting faith, which is the mark of those that are justified by God &c." The same Origen, in the same book, bringeth in the example of the thief upon the cross, and of the woman that had been a sinner but was saved by her faith (Luke vii. [39, 50]), to the same purpose<sup>b</sup>.

[St. Jerome again.]

§ 21. And I will not omit the words of St. Jerome upon that of Isai. lxiv. 5, "All our righteousness is like a menstruous rag." *Libro xvii. "In quo considerandum, quod iustitia quæ in Lege est, ad comparationem evangelicæ puritatis immunditia nominetur; etenim non est glorificatum quod prius glorificatum fuit, propter excellentem gloriam:"* and, by and by; 61 "*Si quis igitur post Evangelium Christi, et adventum Filii Dei, pædagogæ Legis observat ceremonias, audiat populum confitentem quod omnis illa iustitia panno sordidissimo comparetur; cui et Esther diadema suum, quod erat regię potestatis insigne, comparat:"*—"Where it is to be considered, that the righteousness which is in the Law, in comparison of the purity of the Gospel, is called uncleanness; for that which was counted glorious, is not glorious, in regard of that glory that excelleth:" and, "If any man then, after the Gospel of Christ, and the coming of the Son of God, observe the ceremonies of that pædagogical Law, let him hear the people confess, that all that righteousness is comparable to a most filthy rag; wherewith also Esther compares her diadem, though the ensign of royal power<sup>c</sup>." The prophet brings in the synagogue confessing itself destitute of righteousness. The Apostles shew, that the Church only furnisheth that righteousness through faith, which the synagogue, by the Law, cannot have. And shall

<sup>a</sup> Origen, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom., lib. iii. c. 9; Op., tom. iv. p. 517. I. E, 2. A. ed. Bened.: which edition reads "*tamen operatorem,*" and "*quod*

*iis deest."*

<sup>b</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 517. I. A—D.

<sup>c</sup> St. Jerome, Op., tom. iii. pp. 474, 475.



we say, that St. Jerome abuses the prophet, in limiting that uncleaness, which the prophet acknowledgeth even in their righteousness, to that which is to be had by the Law? For though he name only the works of the ceremonial law, yet is all the righteousness that is to be had by the learning of the letter of the Law, of the same nature, not attaining to be done with that disposition of the heart, which only the Gospel produceth.

§ 22. Œcumenius, upon James ii. 14, speaking the sense of some fathers, hath expressed all the points of my position in these terms: “Τινὲς δὲ τῶν πατέρων καὶ οὕτω περὶ τούτου ἔγνωσαν· φασὶ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν Ἀβραάμ, τοῖς χρόνοις διαστελλόμενον, ἐκατέρας πίστεως εἶναι εἰκόνα· καὶ τῆς πρὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, τῆς μὴ ἐπιζητούσης ἔργα, εἰ μὴ τὴν πίστιν μόνην, καὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ᾧ δικαιοῦμεθα πιστεύοντες εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν· καὶ [τῆς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα,] τῆς συνεξευγμένης τοῖς ἔργοις· οὕτως οὐκ ἐναντίον φαίνε[τα]ι τὸ ἐν [τοῖς] Ἀποστόλοις λαλήσαν πνεῦμα· [ἀλλὰ] τῆς μὲν δι’ ὁμολογίας μόνης δικαιοῦσης τὸν προσιόντα, εἰ παραχρῆμα ἀπέλθοι τοῦ βίου· τούτῳ γὰρ οὐ πάρεσιν ἔργα, ἀλλ’ ἐφόδιον αὐτῷ ἱκανὸν ἢ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος κάθαρσις· τῆς δὲ τὸν ἤδη βεβαπτισμένον ἀπαιτούσης καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἔργων ἐπίδειξιν”—“But some of the fathers have thus judged of this business: for they say, that distinguishing Abraham by times, he is the pattern of both faiths: whereof one, going before baptism, requires no works, but only faith, and the profession of salvation, and the word whereby we are justified, believing in Christ; the other is coupled with works: so the Spirit that spoke in the Apostles, shews no contrariety: the one justifying him that approacheth by profession alone, in case he presently depart this life (for such a one hath no works, but the cleansing of baptism is to him a sufficient passport to salvation); the other demanding of him that is already baptized, that he should shew good works<sup>k</sup>.” He had proposed before another way of reconciling the Apostles, by distinguishing several significations in the term of faith; which, in effect and consequence, falls in with this.

§ 23. St. Gregory, *In Evang.* Hom. xx[ix]. “*Quod cum ita* [St. Gregory the Great.]

<sup>k</sup> Œcumen., *In Epist. Jacob.* c. iv. pp. 125, 126. Veron. 1532.

BOOK  
II.[“imple-  
mus”]

*sit, fidei nostræ veritatem in vitæ nostræ consideratione debemus agnoscere. Tunc enim veraciter fideles sumus, si quod verbis promittimus operibus complemus. In die quippe baptismi omnibus nos antiqui hostis operibus atque omnibus pompis abrenunciare promisimus. Itaque unusquisque [vestrum] ad considerationem suam mentis oculos reducat; et si servat post baptismum, quod ante baptismum spondit, certus jam quia fidelis est, gaudeat.”*

—“Which seeing so it is, we are to acknowledge the truth of our faith in the consideration of our life. For then are we truly faithful (or believers), if we accomplish by works what we promise by words. For at the day of our baptism we promise to renounce all the works and all the pomps of our ancient foe. Let every man therefore turn the eyes of his mind to the consideration of himself; and if he observe after baptism that which he promised before baptism, being now assured that he is faithful (or a believer), let him rejoice.” He ascribeth that justification, which requireth good works, to the fulfilling of that promise, which our baptism presupposeth.

[Com-  
mentary  
attributed  
to St. Am-  
brose.]

§ 24. To the same purpose, the commentary upon St. Paul’s Epistles that goes under St. Ambrose his name, upon Rom. iv. 8. “*Manifeste beati sunt, quibus sine labore vel opere aliquo remittuntur iniquitates et peccata teguntur, nulla ab his requisita pœnitentiæ opera, sed tantum ut credant:*”—by and 62 by;—“*Quemadmodum autem ad pœnitentium potest pertinere personam, cum dicit, ‘Beati quorum tecta sunt peccata;’ cum constet pœnitentes labore ac gemitu peccatorum remissionem acquirere? aut quomodo martyrio congruit, quod dicit, ‘Beatus vir cui non imputavit Dominus peccatum;’ cum sciamus gloriam martyrii passionibus et pressuris acquiri? propheta autem, tempus felix in adventu Servatoris prævidens, beatos nominat, quibus sine labore vel aliquo opere per lavacrum remittuntur et teguntur et non imputantur peccata.*”—“Manifestly they are happy, whose iniquities are remitted, and whose sins are covered, without the labour of any work, not requiring of them any pains of penance, but only to believe:” and, “But how can it belong to the person of penitents, when he saith, ‘Blessed are they whose sins are covered;’ seeing it is mani-

[“nunc-  
pat”]

<sup>1</sup> S. Greg. M., In Evang., lib. ii. Hom. xxix. § 3; Op., tom. i. p. 1570. C. D. ed. Bened.



fest, that penitents attain remission of sins by labour and groans? or how agrees that which he saith with martyrdom, 'Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin;' seeing we know, that the glory of martyrdom is attained by sufferings and pressures? but the prophet, foreseeing a happy time at our Saviour's coming, names them blessed whose sins are remitted, and covered, and not imputed, by the laver" (of baptism), "without the labour of any work<sup>m</sup>." Whether or no this opposition, between remission of sins which baptism alone, and that which penance and martyrdom giveth, be pertinently here alleged and like a divine (for baptism is the undertaking of martyrdom if God require it, and penance is the voluntary undergoing of it when sin requireth it); evident it is, that baptism is here the boundary of that justification which faith alone promiseth. And upon Heb. iv. 11, he says, that God gives "*requiem sempiternam fidem habentibus, eam tamen quæ per dilectionem operatur, non credentibus pœnam perpetuam; ne forte, relicta pollicitatione quam dedimus Deo in baptismo, iterum revertamur ad opera infidelitatis, quæ abdicavi[mus] coram multis testibus*"—"everlasting rest to those who have faith, but that which worketh by love; perpetual pain to those who believe not: lest peradventure, abandoning the promise which we made to God at our baptism, we return again to the works of infidelity, which we renounce before many witnesses<sup>n</sup>." Where the damnation of a Christian is imputed to the transgressing of that promise which he makes to God in baptism.

§ 25. And the true St. Ambrose, when he says (lib. i. Epist. i.), "*Nec enim fides sola ad perfectionem satis est, nisi etiam baptismatis adjiciatur gratia, et sanguinem Christi redemptus accipiat*"—"for neither sufficeth faith alone to perfection, unless the grace of baptism be added, and he that is redeemed receive the Blood of Christ<sup>o</sup>;"—clearly compriseth the sacrament of baptism (after which the baptized always received the eucharist in the ancient Church<sup>p</sup>,

<sup>m</sup> In Append. ad Opera S. Ambros., pp. 48. E, F, 49. A. ed. Bened.

<sup>n</sup> Id., In Heb. iv. 11: inter Op. S. Ambros. Paris. 1586. tom. iii. p. 761. A. The tract is not even admitted into the Appendix of the Benedictine edition of St. Ambrose.

<sup>o</sup> S. Ambros., Epist. vii. § 20; tom. ii. p. 782. C. ed. Bened.—Epist. i. in older editions.

<sup>p</sup> See Vice-Comes, Observ. Eccles., De Bapt., lib. v. c. 34: tom. i. pp. 382—386.

BOOK II. whereupon St. Augustin afore mentions "*sacramenta fidei*" in the plural number, "the sacraments of faith"<sup>9</sup>) within that faith which alone justifieth. But the same St. Ambrose, *Offic.* ii. 2: "*Habet ergo vitam æternam fides, quia fundamentum bonum est; habent et bona facta, quia vir justus et dictis et rebus probatur*"—"Therefore faith hath eternal life, because the foundation is good; and so have good works, because a man is tried to be righteous by both saying and doing<sup>r</sup>:" that is, by doing as he says; by doing those works which by his baptism he undertakes to do.

[St. Basil.]

§ 26. St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 12. "*Πίστις μὲν γὰρ τελειοῦται διὰ βαπτίσματος, βάπτισμα δὲ θεμελιούται διὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ὀνομάτων ἑκατέρα πληροῦνται· ὥς γὰρ πιστεύομεν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ βαπτίζομεθα εἰς τὸ Ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ προάγει μὲν [ἡ]*

[“πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν . . . ἐπακολουθεῖ.”]

*ὁμολογία εἰς σωτηρίαν εἰσάγουσα, ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ τὸ βάπτισμα, ἐπισφράγιζον ἡμῶν τὴν συγκατάθεσιν*”—“For faith is perfected by baptism, and baptism is founded upon faith, and both are fulfilled by the same names: for as we believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so are we baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and profession goes afore, introducing to salvation; but baptism follows, sealing up our assent<sup>s</sup> ;”—not only to the demand, Dost thou believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? but when it is further demanded, Wilt thou be baptized upon these terms? And this profession so sealed is that which saveth him that departs upon it, not him that survives to falsify it.

[St. Chrysostom.]

§ 27. St. Chrysostom, in *Rom.* iv. 2. Hom. viii., makes a long comparison to shew that man glorifies God more by believing than by keeping His commandments<sup>t</sup>: which certainly 63 proceedeth not nor can hold in those works that presuppose faith, having in them all that whereby faith glorifieth God, and more; and therefore is to be limited to works done be-

<sup>9</sup> See above, § 19. note x.

<sup>r</sup> S. Ambros., *De Offic. Ministr.*, lib. ii. c. ii. § 7; *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 72. B.

<sup>s</sup> S. Basil., *Lib. de Spir. Sancto*, c. xii.; *Op.*, tom. iii. pp. 23. E, 24. A. ed. Bened. For *ἐπισφράγιζον* Thorndike

had erroneously corrected (in MS.) *ἐπισφραγίζουσα*.

<sup>t</sup> S. Chrys., In *Epist. ad Rom.* Hom. viii. § 1; *Op.*, tom. ix. pp. 497, 498. ed. Bened.: tom. iii. pp. 54, 55. ed. Savil.



fore faith. And therefore of those works is St. Chrysostom CHAP. IX.  
 to be understood, when he says (as oftentimes he doth) that a  
 man is justified without works by faith or by grace:—*In*  
*Gal.* iii. 12<sup>u</sup>;—*In Rom.* iii. 27. Homil. vii. <sup>v</sup>;—*In Ephes.* ii.  
 [9,] 10. Homil. iv. <sup>x</sup> The reason being always that of Theo-<sup>[Theodo-</sup>  
 doret, upon *Galat.* iii. 22: “Διήλεγξεν ἡ θεία γραφή καὶ <sup>ret.]</sup>  
 τοὺς πρὸ νόμου καὶ τοὺς ἐν νόμῳ, τοὺς μὲν τὸν τῆς φύσεως,  
 τοὺς δὲ τὸν Μωσαϊκὸν παραβαίνοντας [νόμον] ἀλεξιφάρ-<sup>[“παραβε-</sup>  
 μακον δὲ καὶ τούτοις κακείοις τὴν ἐπηγγελμένην διὰ τῆς <sup>βηκότας”]</sup>  
 πίστεως προσενήνοχε σωτηρίαν”—“The Scripture of God  
 convinceth both those that were afore the Law, and un-  
 der it, as transgressors, as well these of Moses’ law as  
 those of the law of nature; offering the salvation that is  
 promised by faith for an antidote, both for these and for  
 those<sup>y</sup>.” If the law of Moses were not of force to jus-  
 tify, much less the law of nature. Now the Gospel sup-  
 poseth both Jews and Gentiles under sin, and liable to  
 God’s wrath, till the Gospel come; as St. Paul, in the be-  
 ginning of his Epistle to the Romans, declareth. Not as if  
 no man had been saved under the Law, or before it; but be-  
 cause they who then were saved, belonged not to the law of  
 Moses, or that of nature, but to the Gospel, as saved by the  
 means of it. So said St. Jerome afore<sup>z</sup>, that they were saved  
 by the preaching of faith under the law of nature. And so  
 thin was the number of them who thus were saved, that it  
 was requisite the Gospel should come, lest the means which  
 God had used to restore man afore might seem to have been  
 employed to no purpose. So to be saved by faith and not by  
 works, is the same with St. Paul, according to the fathers, as  
 to be justified by being a Christian, and not by being a Jew,  
 by the Gospel and not by the Law.

§ 28. So Tertullian, *Cont. Marc.* v. 3: “*Ejus ergo Dei erit* <sup>[Tertul-</sup>  
*fides, in qua vivit justus, cujus et Lex in qua non justificatur* <sup>lian.]</sup>  
*operarius; proinde, si in Lege maledictio est, in fide<sup>a</sup> bene-* <sup>[“vivet”]</sup>

<sup>u</sup> Id., In cap. iii. Epist. ad Galat. Comment., § 3; Op., tom. x. pp. 699. D, 700. A. ed. Bened.: tom. iii. p. 739. ed. Savil.

<sup>v</sup> Id., In Epist. ad Rom. Hom. vii. § 3; Op., tom. ix. pp. 486. C, 487. C. ed. Bened.: tom. iii. pp. 47, 48. ed. Savil.

<sup>x</sup> Id., In Epist. ad Ephes. Hom. iv. § 2, 3; Op., tom. xi. p. 28. C, D. ed. Bened.: tom. iii. p. 782. ed. Savil.

<sup>y</sup> Theodoret, in Epist. ad Gal. iv. 22; Op., tom. iii. pp. 276. D, 277. A.

<sup>z</sup> See above, § 18. note s.

<sup>a</sup> “in fide vero benedictio, utrun-  
 que,” &c.; continuing the sentence.

BOOK  
II.

*dictio*—"Therefore that faith whereby the just liveth, shall be the same God's, Whose the Law is, whereby he that worketh is not justified; accordingly, if the curse come by the Law, then the blessing by faith<sup>b</sup>." For that faith, which properly stands in opposition to the Law, is Christianity.

[St. Hilary of Poitiers.]  
["contuebantur"]

§ 29. St. Hilary, *In Matt. can. viii.*: "*Movet scribas remissum ab homine peccatum; hominem enim tantum in Jesu Christo intuebantur, et remissum ab Eo quod Lex laxare non poterat; fides enim sola justificat*"—"The scribes are moved that sin should be remitted by a man: for they looked upon Jesus Christ as a mere man, Who remitted that which the Law could not loose; for faith alone justifieth<sup>c</sup>." Faith only justifieth, in opposition to the Law, which remitteth no sin. Therefore faith is Christianity.

[St. Clement of Alexandria.]

§ 30. Clemens Alexandr., *Strom. ii.*: "*Μάθησις γοῦν καὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι ταῖς ἐντολαῖς, ὃ ἐστὶ πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ*"—"To learn is to obey the commandments, which is to believe God<sup>d</sup>:" because, forsooth, to profess the faith is to undertake to live by God's commandments. *Strom. iv.*: "*Ψεύδεται τοίνυν τὸν Θεὸν ὃς οὐ πιστεύει τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ πιστεύει δὲ ὁ μὴ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολάς*"—"He therefore plays false with God, that believes not God; but he that keepeth not the commandments, believes not<sup>e</sup>." Again: "*Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν ποιῇτε εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε, ὅσα ἂν ὑπὸ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ποιεῖν ἐπιτέτραπται*"—"All therefore, whatsoever ye do, do to the glory of God, whatsoever it is permitted to do under the rule of faith<sup>f</sup>." Here that part of Christianity, which prescribes a Christian what he is to do, what not, is called the rule of faith; because he believes that God requires it at his hands, though he undertake [no] more than to believe it. *Strom. vii.*: "*Ὁ δὲ μετὰ [τῶν] δεόντων λογισμῶν παραδεξιόμενος προθύμως καὶ φυλάξας τὰς ἐντολάς, πιστὸς οὗτος*"—"He is a believer (or faithful), that receives the commandments upon due consideration, and keeps them<sup>g</sup>."

["ὅσα ποιεῖτε"]  
["ὅσα ὑπὸ"]

<sup>b</sup> Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, lib. v. c. 3: *Op.*, p. 784. E.

<sup>c</sup> S. Hilar. Pictav., *In Matt. Comment.*, can. viii.; *Op.*, p. 150. 2. D. Paris. 1572.

<sup>d</sup> S. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, lib. ii. c. 11: *Op.*, tom. i. p. 454. ed. Potter.

<sup>e</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, lib. iv. c. 7; *ibid.*, p. 582;

"*ψεύδεται τοίνυν τὸν Κύριον, μάλλον δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διέψενσται ἐλπίδα, ὃς οὐ πιστεύει τῷ Θεῷ· οὐ πιστεύει δὲ ὁ μὴ ποιῶν ἃ ἐνετείλατο.*"

<sup>f</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, c. 15; *ibid.*, p. 607.

<sup>g</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, lib. vii. c. 3; *ibid.*, p. 840.



§ 31. Pelagius upon Rom. x. 4: "*Talis est ille qui in Chris-* CHAP.  
IX.  
*tum credidit, die qua credidit, qualis ille qui universam legem*  
*implevit*"—"Such is he that believeth, the day that he be-  
lieveth, as is he that hath fulfilled the whole law<sup>b</sup>." In the  
day of his baptism (that is, if he lives not to transgress it),  
his title to heaven is as good, as if he had done whatsoever  
the law requireth. I shewed you before, that Pelagius in the  
matter of justification departs not from the Church.

§ 32. Clemens of Rome, St. Paul's scholar, whom I will [St. Cle-  
ment of  
Rome.]  
64 end with, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 13: "*Ἀβραάμ,*  
*ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς, πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον*  
*γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι [τοῦ] Θεοῦ*"—"Abraham, who was called  
friend, was found faithful in that he became obedient to the  
word of God<sup>i</sup>."—p. 40: "*Τίνος χάριν εὐλογήθη ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν* [“εὐλογή-  
θη”]  
*Ἀβραάμ; οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιή-  
σας*"—"Wherefore was our father Abraham blessed? was it  
not because he did righteousness and truth through faith<sup>k</sup>?"  
—p. 41: "*Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν, καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν, οὐ*  
*δι’ αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειρ-*  
*γάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος Αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ*  
*θελήματος Αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι’ ἐαυτῶν*  
*δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, [ἢ εὐ-*  
*σεβείας,] ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλ-*  
*λὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι’ ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκρά-*  
*τωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν*"—"They were all, therefore, glorified  
and magnified, not by themselves, or their own works or just  
actions which they had done, but by His will: and therefore  
we, who are called by His will through Christ Jesus, are not  
justified by ourselves, or our own wisdom, or understanding,  
or works that we have done with holiness of heart; but by  
faith, whereby Almighty God hath justified all from the  
beginning of the world<sup>l</sup>." The fathers were not justified by  
their own works; but because, being called by the will of  
God, as we to Christianity through Christ Jesus, they were  
found faithful, in doing righteousness and truth through

<sup>b</sup> Comment. in Epist. B. Pauli, in  
Epist. ad Rom. x. 4; in Append. ad Op.  
S. Hieron. p. 957. ed. Bened.: ascribed  
to Pelagius (see above, § 18. note t).  
"Qui Christum credidit."

<sup>i</sup> S. Clem. Rom., Epist. ad Cor. i.  
p. 13. ed. Jun.: c. x. pp. 40, 42. ed.

Jacobson.

<sup>k</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 40: c. xxxi. p. 110. ed.  
Jacobson.

<sup>l</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 41: c. xxxii. p. 112.  
ed. Jacobson; who reads "πάντας τοῦ  
ἀπ' αἰῶνος."

BOOK II. faith: as he said of Abraham before. For the works of faith cannot be counted our own works; which we had never done, had not God's call gone afore.

[Conclu-  
sion.]

§ 33. That faith then which alone justifieth, importeth as great and as real a change in the judgment and resolution of him that attaineth it, from unrighteous to righteous, as the difference between the law of all righteousness and the law of all unrighteousness signifieth. For upon other terms can no man profess himself a Christian. And as great and as real a change it is, that succeeds upon that change, between the relation, which he that is so changed did hold towards God afore, and now holds afterwards, as the difference between the heir of God's wrath and of His kingdom importeth. But supposing that change which justifying faith importeth already in being, that change which the effect of it in justifying importeth, is, of necessity, merely moral; and consisteth only in the difference between that remission of sins and God's kingdom, which the promise of His grace, and the debt of punishment, which the sentence of His justice, declareth. Whether therefore justifying faith be God's work or not (which here I dispute not, because here I cannot resolve) for the cause of it, the effect of it in justifying, which here I debate, will signify no more, than an attribute due by right to him that hath it, upon God's promise: importing no change in him, but that which it supposeth; how much soever it import his salvation, that his relation to God be so changed. For I may safely here suppose that, which the title of this dispute and the very name of the covenant of grace attributed to the Gospel of Christ involveth; that faith justifieth not by virtue of the work naturally, but morally, by that will and appointment of God, by virtue whereof the covenant of grace standeth. And this necessarily holds in the sense of the Church, when it ascribeth justification to faith alone, in opposition to the works of the Law.

[Remis-  
sion of  
sins, how  
attributed  
by the fa-  
thers to  
charity.]

§ 34. A necessary consequence whereof is this; that the forgiveness of our sins will presuppose and require of us, that we forgive others their offences against us: because we hold the forgiveness of our sins by the title of our Christianity; whereof seeing it is one point, that we forgive other men their offences against us, of necessity, failing of the con-



dition required on our part, we fail of the promise tendered on God's. Therefore the fathers also, as the Scriptures afore, attribute remission of sins to charity, to alms-deeds, and to forgiving of offences against us. CHAP. IX.

§ 35. Clemens in his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 65: [St. Clement of Rome.] “Μακάριοι ἔσμεν, ἀγαπητοὶ, εἰ [τὰ] προστάγματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐποιούμεεν ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἀγάπης, εἰς τὸ ἀφεθῆναι ἡμῖν δι’ ἀγάπης τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν”—“Happy were we if we did do the commandments of God in the concord of love, that our sins might be forgiven us through love<sup>m</sup>.”

§ 36. The Apostolical Constitutions, vii. 13: [The Apostolical Constitutions.] “Ἐὰν ἔχῃς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου δὸς, ἵνα ἐργάσῃ εἰς λύτρωσιν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου· ἐλεημοσύναις γὰρ καὶ πίστεσιν ἀποκαθαίρονται ἀμαρτίαι”—“If thou hast, give by thine own hands, that thou mayest act to the redemption of thy sins; for by alms and truth sins are purged away<sup>n</sup>.”

§ 37. Lactantius, vi. 12: [Lactantius.] “*Magna est misericordiæ merces, cui Deus pollicetur peccata Se omnia remissurum: si audieris, inquit, preces supplicis tui, et Ego audiam tuas; si misertus laborantium fueris, Ego et in tuo labore miserebor: si autem non respexeris, nec adjuveris, et Ego animum [tuum] contra te geram, tuisque te legibus judicabo*”—“Great are the wages of mercy, which God hath promised, that He will remit all sins: if thou hearest, saith He, the prayers of thy suppliant, I also will hear thine; if thou takest pity on them that are in pain, I also will take pity upon thy pain: but if thou respect not, nor help them, I also will carry a mind against thee, and judge thee by thine own law<sup>o</sup>.”

§ 38. St. Chrysostom, tomo vi. *Orat.* lxvii.: [St. Chrysostom.] “Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα ταύτης οὐκ ἐλάττων, τὸ μὴ μνησικακεῖν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, τὸ κρατεῖν ὀργῆς, τὸ ἀφιέναι τὰ συνδουλικὰ ἀμαρτήματα· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀφεθήσεται [καὶ] τὰ εἰς τὸν Δεσπότην ἡμαρτημένα· ἰδοὺ καὶ δεύτερον ἀμαρτημάτων καθάρσιον, ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε, φησί”—“But there is another way of cleansing sin, not inferior to this; not to remember the malice of enemies, to contain wrath, to remit the sins of fellow servants: for so those which we have done against our Lord shall be forgiven

<sup>m</sup> S. Clem. Rom., Epist. ad Corinth. I., p. 65. ed. Jun.: c. 1. p. 156. ed. Jacobson.

<sup>n</sup> Constit. Apostol., lib. vii. c. 13; ap.

PP. Apost., tom. i. p. 369. ed. Coteler.

<sup>o</sup> Lactant., Instit. Divin., lib. vi. De Vero Cultu, c. 12; p. 548. Oxon. 1684.

BOOK II. us: behold also a second way to purge sins; for if ye forgive, saith He<sup>p</sup>." And by and by: "Εἰ δὲ καὶ τετάρτην θέλεις μαθεῖν, τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ἐρῶ, πολλὴν γὰρ [αὕτη] ἔχει δύναμιν καὶ ἄφατον· καὶ γὰρ τῷ Ναβουχοδονόσορ εἰς πᾶν εἶδος κακίας ἐλθόντι, καὶ πᾶσαν εὐσέβειαν ἐπελθόντι, φησὶν ὁ Δαυὶδ· Βασιλεῦ, ἡ βουλή μου ἀρεσάτω σοι, τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι, καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας σου ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς πενήτων"—"But if you will learn a fourth, I will name alms; for it hath great force and not to be expressed: for to Nabuchodonosor, being arrived at all kind of wickedness, and going over all goodness, Daniel saith, . . Redeem thy sins with alms-deeds, and thy transgressions with pitying the poor<sup>q</sup>." To the same purpose the same St. Chrysostom makes forgiving of injuries, giving thanks in affliction, mercy in helping our neighbours, the cure for sin; as well as humility, confession, and prayer (*In 2 ad Corinth. Hom. ii. r*): because thereby a Christian retires to his promise in baptism, expecting remission only from God's promise in the same. So also *In Epist. ad Rom. Hom. xxv.*<sup>s</sup>

[Dan. iv. 27.]

[St. Ambrose.]

§ 39. St. Ambrose, *De Pœnitentia*, ii. 5: '*David beatum prædicavit et illum, cui peccata per baptismum remittuntur, et illum, cujus peccata operibus teguntur*'—'David proclaims for blessed, both him whose sins are remitted by baptism, and him whose sins are covered with works<sup>t</sup>.' So, 'charity covers many sins' done after baptism.

[James v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 8.]

[Cæsarius of Arles.]

§ 40. Cæsarius of Arles, *Homil. viii.*: "*Quoties infirmos visitamus, in carcere positos requirimus, discordes ad concordiam revocamus, indicto in Ecclesia jejunio jejunamus, hospitibus pedes abluimus, ad vigilias frequentius convenimus, eleemosynam ante ostium prætereuntibus pauperibus damus, inimicis nostris quoties petierint indulgemus; istis operibus et his simi-*

<sup>p</sup> S. Chrys., *Orat. de Diabolo Tentatore ad Pop. Antioch.*: Op., tom. vi. *Orat. lxxvii.* p. 694. ll. 30—33. ed. Savil.; tom. ii. p. 266. B, C. ed. Bened.

<sup>q</sup> Id., *ibid.*, ll. 37—41. ed. Savil.; p. 266. D. ed. Bened.

<sup>r</sup> Id., Op., tom. iii. pp. 548 sq. ed. Savil.; tom. x. pp. 427 sq. ed. Bened.

<sup>s</sup> Id., Op., tom. iii. pp. 200 sq. ed. Savil.; tom. ix. pp. 701 sq. ed. Bened.

<sup>t</sup> S. Ambros., *De Pœn.*, lib. ii. c. v. § 35; Op., tom. ii. p. 424. D: "Sicut et docuit David dicens, 'Beati quorum remissæ sunt iniquitates et quorum tec-

ta sunt peccata; beatus vir cui non imputavit Dominus peccatum.' utrumque enim beatum dicit, et cujus iniquitas remittitur per lavacrum, et cujus peccatum tegitur operibus bonis." St. Ambrose has nearly the same words in two other passages (*De Noe et Arca*, c. xxxi. § 117; Op., tom. i. p. 274. F: and *Apol. David.*, c. ix. § 49; *ibid.*, p. 692. A, B), but the passage in the text is not to be found in express words in his works. It seems to be a quotation made from memory.



*libus minuta peccata quotidie redimuntur*”—“As oft as we visit the sick, seek those that are put in prison, reduce those that fall out to agreement, fast when a fast is published in the Church, wash the feet of strangers, assemble more frequently to wakes<sup>u</sup>, give alms to the poor that go by the door, pardon our enemies as oft as they demand; by these works, and like to these, small sins are every day redeemed<sup>x</sup>.”

§ 41. St. Augustin, *Libro L. Homil. Hom. L. cap. iii.*: [St. Augustin.]  
*“Non enim ea dimitti precamur, quæ jam in baptismo dimissa sunt, et nisi dimissa credimus, de ipsa fide dubitamus; sed utique de quotidianis peccatis hoc dicimus, pro quibus etiam sacrificia eleemosynarum, jejuniorum, et ipsarum orationum et supplicationum, quisque pro suis viribus offerre non cessat”*—  
 “For we pray not for the pardon of those which are already pardoned in baptism, which if we believe not that they are pardoned, we call the faith itself in doubt; but this forsooth we speak of daily sins, for which also no man ceaseth to offer, according to his power, the sacrifices of alms, and fasting, and even of prayers and supplications<sup>y</sup>.”

§ 42. St. Gregory, *In Psalm. ii. Pœnitent.*: [St. Gregory the Great.]  
*“Habent enim sancti viri aliquid quod in hac vita operire debeant; quia omnino est impossibile, ut in loquutione aut etiam in cogitatione nunquam delinquant: student igitur viri Dei oculorum et lingue culpas tegere meritis vitæ; student pondere bonorum operum premere immoderata verborum”*—“For holy men have something in this life which they ought to hide; because it is altogether impossible, that in speech or at least in thought  
 66 they should never fail: therefore the men of God study to cover the faults of the eyes and tongue with the merits of their lives; they study to press down immoderate words with the weight of good works<sup>z</sup>.” And by and by: *“Quia hoc quod tegitur, inferius ponitur, et aliud aliquid superducitur, ut quod est subterpositum tegatur, tegere peccata dicimus, quæ quasi*

<sup>u</sup> “Vigils kept on the days of dedication of churches:” added in margin in MS.—“Antiquitus præter jejunium solebant fideles tota nocte vigilare in Dei laudibus apud ecclesias sanctorum quorum festa præveniebant.” Ferraris, *Prompta Biblioth.*, sub voce *Vigiliæ*.

<sup>z</sup> Cæsar. Arelat., *Hom. viii.*; inter *Magn. Bibl. PP.*, tom. v. P. iii. p. 753.

D, E.

<sup>y</sup> S. Aug., *Serm. cœli.*, De Pœnitentia, c. iii. § 6; *Op.*, tom. v. p. 1355. F, G. ed. Bened.: *Homil. 50* inter L. *Homilias*, in older editions. The Benedictine editors omit the words “dimissa sunt et.”

<sup>z</sup> S. Greg., *Expos. in vii. Psalm. Pœnit.*, in Ps. ii. v. 1: *Op.*, tom. iii. P. ii. p. 474. B. ed. Bened.

BOOK II. *subterponentes abdicamus; quibus nimirum quasi tegmen superducimus, dum bonorum operum nos indumento vestimus: peccata itaque tegimus, si bona facta malis actibus superponamus*" — "Because that which is covered is laid beneath, and something drawn over it to cover that which lies beneath; we are said to cover those sins which we give over, as laying them beneath; over which we draw a kind of covering, when we invest ourselves with the covering of good works: therefore we cover sins, if we lay good deeds over evil works <sup>a</sup>."

## CHAPTER X.

WHAT PELAGIUS QUESTIONETH CONCERNING THE GRACE OF CHRIST. WHAT SOCINUS FURTHER OF THE STATE OF CHRIST BEFORE HIS BIRTH. THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND ADAM IN ST. PAUL, EVIDENCETH ORIGINAL SIN. CONCUISCENCE IN THE UNREGENERATE, AND THE INABILITY OF THE LAW TO SUBDUE IT, EVICT THE SAME. THE SECOND BIRTH BY THE HOLY GHOST EVIDENCETH THAT THE FIRST BIRTH PROPAGATETH SIN.

What Pelagius questioneth, [and Socinus,] concerning the grace of Christ.

Now, though all agree that we are justified, not by the Law nor by works, but by the Gospel and by grace (because it is the mere grace of God that moved Him to send our Lord Christ, by Him to convince the world that the Gospel is true and ought to be embraced); yet, that the grace of Christ, that is, those helps of grace which God gives in consideration of His merits and sufferings, are requisite to enable those to whom this conviction is tendered, to embrace it and to persevere in it, neither Pelagius of old, nor Socinus at present, will yield: nor that Abraham should have any thing to brag of, if he should pretend to be justified by those works, which the free will of him, whose understanding is convict that the Gospel is true, is without other help able to produce; or that in consideration of any such help the Gospel is to be counted grace, which if the helps it requireth should be purchased by obeying, it were not to be counted of free grace.

§ 2. The words of Pelagius are well enough known, re-

<sup>a</sup> S. Greg., *ibid.* C.



maining upon record in St. Augustin, *De Gratia Christi*, CHAP.  
X. cap. vii. : "*Adjuvat enim nos per doctrinam et revelationem Suam, dum cordis nostri oculos aperit ; dum nobis, ne præsenti-  
bus occupemur, futura demonstrat ; dum diaboli pandit in-  
sidias ; dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiæ cælestis  
illuminat*"—"For He helps us by revealing His doctrine,  
while He opens the eyes of our heart ; while He shews us  
things to come, lest we be busied about things present ; while  
He lays open the ambushes of the devil ; while He enlightens  
us with the manifold gift of heavenly grace<sup>b</sup>." And again,  
cap. x. : "*Operatur in nobis Deus velle quod bonum est, velle quod  
sanctum est, dum nos terrenis cupiditatibus inherentes*" (aliter  
deditos) "*et mutorum animantium more tantum præsentia dili-* [*modo  
animan-  
tium tan-  
tum.*"]  
*gentes, futuræ gloriæ magnitudine et præmiorum pollicitatione  
succendit ; dum revelatione sapientiæ in desiderium Dei stupen-  
tem suscitât voluntatem ; dum nobis suadet omne quod bonum  
est*"—"God works in us the willing of that which is good  
and holy, while He inflames us, being addicted to earthly  
lusts, and loving only things present, like mute creatures,  
with the promise of a great reward of glory to come ; while  
by revealing of wisdom, He raises the dull will to the desire of  
God ; while He persuadeth us to all that is good<sup>c</sup>." Where,  
besides the grace of God in making us reasonable creatures,  
he acknowledgeth also the grace of the law, meaning thereby  
the doctrine and motives of Christianity ; whereby, saith he,  
the mind is enlightened to understand the difference between  
things transitory and everlasting, and the will is inclined and  
persuaded to prefer true good before that which is counter-  
feit<sup>d</sup>. Which being said by a Christian, though I see no ex-  
67 press mention that he makes of the Gospel of Christ, neces-  
sarily infers, that notwithstanding he supposed the same with  
Socinus ; to wit, that the conviction which the motives of

<sup>b</sup> Pelag., ap. S. Aug., *De Gratia Christi*, lib. i. c. vii. § 8 ; Op., tom. x. p. 233. F.

<sup>c</sup> Id., *ibid.*, c. x. § 11 ; *ibid.*, p. 235. B, C. The Bened. editors read "de-  
ditos ;" as did the Louvain editors  
before them, and earlier still Erasmus.

<sup>d</sup> St. Augustin's commentary on the  
above quotation is as follows : "Quid  
manifestius, nihil aliud eum" (Pela-  
gium) "dicere gratiam qua Deus in  
nobis operatur velle quod bonum est,

quam legem et doctrinam ? . . . Et si  
inter docere et suadere, vel potius ex-  
hortari, distare aliquid videtur, etiam  
hoc tamen doctrinæ generalitate con-  
cluditur. . . Sed nos eam gratiam vo-  
lumus iste aliquando fateatur, qua  
futuræ gloriæ magnitudo non solum  
promittitur verum etiam creditur et  
speratur ; nec solum revelatur sapi-  
entia, verum et amatur ; nec solum  
suadetur omne quod bonum est, verum  
et persuadetur." *Ibid.*, p. 235. C, D.

BOOK  
II.

faith tender to all men that are made acquainted with it, as it is necessarily the production of God's mere grace, so is it enough to enable a reasonable man (being so convict, how much the world to come is to be preferred before this) to embrace, and to persevere in, that course by which a man stands convict that he may attain it.

§ 3. And though Socinus hath more expressly maintained, that upon the embracing of Christianity the Holy Ghost is given, to enable Christians to prefer that which their profession importeth<sup>e</sup>; yet, as I find the truth thereof so manifestly laid down in the Scriptures of the New Testament, that I cannot see how he should pretend to be a Christian that should deny it; so can I not remember, that Pelagius ever went about to deny it. On the contrary, there is appearance enough, that Pelagius acknowledgeth the grace of the Holy Ghost, whether in bringing a man to be, or to persevere unto the end, a Christian. His own words are yet extant, upon 1 Cor. ii. 10: "To us, who by believing have deserved to receive the Spirit of God, which shews us His will"—"*Nobis, [“Ejus.”] qui fide meruimus Spiritum Dei accipere, qui voluntatem Suam nobis ostendit,*"—"hath God revealed it<sup>f</sup>." And by and by;

<sup>e</sup> Spiritus sanctus "Spiritus promissionis appellatur. Estque illa Dei virtus per quam admirabili ratione efficitur, ut nos aliquando in cœlestis hæreditatis possessione constituendos esse exploratissimum habeamus; hoc est, ut non solum nos illam adepturos esse utcumque speremus; cum ejusmodi persuasionem vel ex sola Evangelii disciplina et externis ejus confirmationibus haurire possumus; sed ut firmissimam omnique dubitationis expertem spem in ea re ponamus, eaque adjuti, neque ullo periculorum metu neque ulla vi cupiditatis atque libidinis neque ullo humanæ consuetudinis exemplo neque opum terrestrium inanumque honorum illecebris ab officio deducamur. Hic enim divinus Christi spiritus spem illam, quæ per Evangelii predicationem ac confirmationem externis sensibus subjectam nobis facta erat, animis hominum cœlitus illapsus, interna quadam ratione confirmat atque corroborat." Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. xiii. pp. 81, 82.—"Probatur, Spiritum Sanctum non dari nisi jam credentibus;" but, "distinguen-

guendum inter utrumque Spiritum Sanctum de quibus paulo ante meminimus; et fatendum, sine Dei Spiritu ne posse quidem in Christum credi, sed hunc Spiritum omnibus dari quibus Ipse Christus rite annunciat; Divinum vero Spiritum, quo in cordibus nostris veritas Divinorum promissorum obsignatur, et pignus futuræ nostræ felicitatis et cœlestis hæreditatis in Sanctis Litteris nuncupatur, hunc, inquam, non concedi nisi iis qui jam in Jesum Christum credunt." Socin., Notæ in Dial. de Justif., § 20; Op., tom. i. p. 611. a, b.—"Quinetiam æternæ vitæ ac beatitudinis amplissimis et præclarissimis promissionibus adjunctis, nobis ad tam illustre opus nos accingendos et stimulos adhibuit et vires dedit; atque accinetos Spiritu Suo Sancto ac cœlesti in perpetuum fovere, et ad propositam metam perducere destinavit." Id., De Christo Salvatore, P. I. c. iv.; ibid., tom. ii. p. 129. b.—So also Catech. Racov., Sect. vi. c. vi. De Promisso Spiritus Sancti, p. 136. Staurop. 1680.

<sup>f</sup> Comment. in Epist. I. ad Cor. c. ii.



"*Sensum Domini, qui est in viris spiritualibus, sine Spiritu Dei nemo cognovit*"—"No man knows the meaning of God which is in spiritual men, without God's Spirit<sup>g</sup>." And upon Rom. v. 17: "*Quare multa peccata donavit abundantia donationis Spiritus Sancti? quia multa sunt dona: ipsa enim justitia donatur in baptismo, non ex merito datur*"—"Why hath the abundant gift of the Holy Ghost pardoned us many sins? because God's gifts are many: for righteousness itself is given in baptism, not rewarded as of merit<sup>h</sup>." For why might not Pelagius, as well as Socinus, make it the purchase of man's free will, upon the tender of Christianity, which is God's grace? For the appearance is sufficient and evident, that Socinus was so disgusted with the opinion, that justifying faith consists in believing that a man is predestinate to everlasting life in consideration of the obedience of Christ imputed to his account, because given for him and the elect in opposition to the rest of mankind<sup>i</sup>; that, supposing the tender of the Gospel, the accepting of it he placeth in the mere act of free will, upon which the gift of the Holy Ghost, necessary to the performance of that which Christianity professeth, depends, as due debt by God's promise; Who, having prevented mankind with that promise, hath suspended that which follows upon this compliance<sup>j</sup>.

v. 10: "Nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum Suum:" in Append. ad Op. S. Hieron., p. 978. ed. Bened.: ascribed to Pelagius. See above, § 18. note t.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid., in v. 16; *ibid.*, p. 979.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid., p. 942. "*Quare multa peccata dimisit, abundantia donationis Spiritus Sancti: quia multa sunt dona. Ipsa etiam justitia donatur per baptismum; non ex merito possidetur.*"

<sup>i</sup> See e. g. the tract *Quod Regni Poloniæ, &c.*, where the opinions of those "qui vulgo Evangelici appellantur," against which Socinus is arguing, are said to be (cap. ii.) 1. the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination, 2. the slavery of the human will, 3. with respect to justification, that "justificationis nostræ coram Deo, . . . hanc esse et causam et rationem, quod Christus Sui sanguinis fusione pro omnibus peccatis nostris, tam præteritis quam præsentibus et futuris, Divinæ justitiæ plenissime satisfecerit; ita ut nihil

aliud præterea ad nos justos coram Deo constituendos requiratur, nisi ut firmiter credamus nos propter hanc causam, et sic propter Ipsum Christum, Deo esse acceptos et gratos." Socin., Op., tom. i. pp. 694, 695.—See also *ibid.*, p. 696. "Explicandus Evangelicorum error . . . quænam sit illa fides in Christum qua justificamur. . . Fiduciam, qua delentur peccata nostra et sic justificamur, statuerunt esse (ut supra monuimus) sibi firmiter hoc ipsum persuadere, et sic confidere quod per Christi mortem deleta fuerint peccata nostra."—And so in his *Fragmenta de Justificatione*, *ibid.*, pp. 620—622: and in the *Disput. de Jesu Christo Salvatore*, P. IV. cc. ix. xii.; *ibid.*, tom. ii. pp. 229 sq., 239 sq.: and repeatedly. See above, c. i. § 9.

<sup>j</sup> "Socinus, acknowledging the tender of the Gospel to be an act of God's free grace, makes the accepting of it an act of mere free will; upon which God is tied by promise to give the Holy

BOOK  
II.

§ 4. It is further to be considered, that Socinus also acknowledged the grace of the Holy Ghost preventing the undertaking of Christianity on our part, under the title of "the Spirit of patefaction;" as you may see by Volkelius, *Instit.* iii. 14<sup>k</sup>: signifying hereby (as it seemeth) that conviction, which the Spirit of God tendereth by the motives of Christianity to manifest the truth of the Gospel, preventing the will with help to enable it, but not effecting either the outward act or the inward resolution to do it; as you may see St. Augustin distinguish upon his own words, related out of his books of free-will; *De Gratia Christi*, i. 41<sup>l</sup>. This I

Ghost to enable a man to perform that which he undertakes: so that it was grace in God to promise, but the rest is due debt, which the mere act of free will obligeth Him to." Added in margin in MS.—e. g. "Quamvis enim nemo vitam æternam consecutus sit qui Christo non obediit, et propterea merces sit Christianæ obedientiæ constituta; quia tamen, quod ii qui Christo obediunt vitam æternam consequantur, hoc a sola Dei liberalitate profectum est, Qui eos quoque qui Christo confidunt, non minus quam cæteros, jure perdere poterat: Dei donum vita æterna merito nuncupatur. Quod si factum aliquod egregium, quale est Christiana obedientia, quod in eo qui accepturus sit requiratur, quin id quod datur donum sit, efficere per se non potest; quanto minus id efficiet ejusdem cui datur, voluntaria tantum et libera acceptio? Fidem autem in Christum non ita Dei donum esse, ut singulari et interiore quadam virtute Divina, cui resisti non possit, in hominum cordibus inscribatur; sed potissimum per externa quædam, iis etiam qui non credunt communia, in ipsis generari, ea quæ," &c., "satis planum facere possunt." Socin., *De Jesu Christo Servatore*, P. IV. c. xii.; *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 240. a.—See also above, note e; and e. i. § 6. note o.

<sup>k</sup> Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. iii. c. xiv. pp. 84—86: of which the subject is "De Spiritu Patefactionis."—"Est quippe et patefactionis Spiritus, qui ab Evangelii disciplina nihil differt seu idem plane cum illa est." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 84.—"Ex his omnibus... facile intelligitur, inter hunc patefactionis, illumque confirmationis Spiri-

tum, hoc interesse, quod ille præcedit, hic subsequitur: ille in omnibus protinus existit, qui Evangelio assentiuntur; hic post assensum Evangelio præstitum, singulari Dei operatione interveniente conceditur, et priori superadditur." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 86.—"Sæpissime autem in sacris Litteris Spiritus Sancti nomine Divinam istam vim, quæ Evangelii patefactione continetur, et omnibus quibus Evangelium patefit, exhibetur, intelligi invenies." Socin., *Notæ in Dial. de Justif.*, § 19; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 611. a.

<sup>l</sup> S. Aug., *De Grat. Christi*, lib. i. c. xli. § 45; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 248. E—G. "Ab illo enim suo manifestissimo dogmate" (Pelagius) "non recedit omnino, ubi tria illa constituit, possibilitatem, voluntatem, actionem; et solam possibilitatem dicit Divino adjuvari semper auxilio; voluntatem autem et actionem nullo Dei adjutorio existimat indigere. Ipsum vero auxilium, quo possibilitatem naturalem perhibet adjuvari, in lege constituit atque doctrina, quam nobis fatetur etiam Sancto Spiritu revelari, propter quod et orandum esse concedit. Sed hoc adjutorium legis atque doctrinæ etiam propheticis fuisse temporibus: adjutorium autem gratiæ, quæ proprie gratia nuncupatur, in Christi esse arbitrat ex exemplo: quod nihilominus ad doctrinam pertinere perspicitur, quæ nobis Evangelica prædicatur: ut videlicet tanquam via demonstrata, qua ambulare debeamus, jam viribus liberi arbitrii, adjutorio nullo alterius indigentes, sufficiamus nobis, ne deficiamus in via: quamvis et ipsam viam contendat etiam sola inveniri posse natura, sed facilius, si adjuvet gratia."



here lay forth on purpose ; to shew, that I cannot come clear of that which I have undertaken to resolve concerning the covenant of grace, nor any man be satisfied in the difficulties that concern it, without taking in hand the whole dispute concerning the free will of man and the free grace of God. For having by the premises shewed, that the condition which the covenant of grace requires on our part, is an act of free will (though such an act as compriseth the engagement of a man's whole life to God's service); unless it appear that the grace of the Holy Ghost, which God found requisite for the performance of Christianity, can never be ascribed to the free will of man as due to the right use of it, it will not sufficiently appear how the Gospel may be called the covenant of grace.

§ 5. But before I go further, I must not omit to observe a great difference between Socinus and Pelagius, and how <sup>What Socinus further, of the state of Christ before His birth.</sup> that difference seems to reflect upon the present dispute. For Socinus first had conceived such disgust, as I said, of that predestination which appoints men to life merely in consideration of the obedience of Christ, as their own for whom it was appointed : then considered well, that free will serves not, so long as the helps, whereby we are enabled to embrace Christ, and to persevere in Christianity, may be attributed to the obedience of Christ ; as assigned by God to the consideration and recognizance of it : and, therefore, found it the only clear course of establishing that force of free will, that he had imagined without consulting the proceedings of the Church against Pelagius, to say, that the merits and sufferings of Christ were not valuable for such a purchase, as being a mere man from His birth : only that He was conceived, not by the way of human generation, but by the Holy Ghost, of the blessed Virgin ; and that afterwards, being thirty years of age or thereabouts, according to the time that John the Baptist began to preach, He was taken up into heaven to God, and there made acquainted with His message of the Gospel to mankind ; which He undertaking, upon the peril of all the hardship which He was to endure at the Jews' hands for it, it pleased God to advance Him for His obedience (though due as to God from His creature) to be God, to the true power and worship of God, though in dependance

BOOK  
II.

upon Himself, originally God<sup>m</sup>. For the obedience of Christ being thus over rewarded in His own person, it remaineth, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, howsoever requisite to the performance of Christianity, be ascribed to the mere goodness of God, which moved Him to propose the promise thereof to those who should embrace the Gospel, as a recompense for so doing; not as any grace of Christ, that is, any help of grace given in consideration of Christ, resolving a man to embrace it<sup>n</sup>.

[Pelagius and his followers, how far partakers in this heresy also.]

§ 6. It cannot be said that Pelagius had any hand in this part of Socinus his heresy: who could not have been heard in the Church at that time, had he once advanced any such ground as this; though so pertinent to his position, as you see by Socinus. But as Pelagius thought of no such thing when he began first to dispute against the grace of Christ, so can it not be said that his followers never thought of having recourse to this plea, as the only clear ground for their posi-

<sup>m</sup> To take a few out of many statements.—“De Christi essentia ita statuo: Illum esse hominem, in Virginis utero et sic sine viri ope Divini Spiritus vi conceptum ac formatum; indeque genitum, primum quidem patibilem ac mortalem, donec scilicet munus sibi a Deo demandatum hic in terris obivit; deinde vero postquam in cœlum ascendit, impatibilem et immortalem factum. . . . Divina ista filiatio Christi eatenus tantum ad Ejus naturam aliquo modo referri potest, quatenus id respicit, quod Christus Divini Spiritus vi sine viri ope in Virginis utero conceptus et formatus fuit.” Socin., *Christ. Rel. Instit.*, § De Natura Christi; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 654. a.—“Nihil verisimilius et verbis Ipsius Christi et hic et alibi magis consentaneum, quam Ipsum Christum, postquam natus est homo, et antequam munus sibi a Deo Patre suo demandatum obire inciperet, in cœlo Divino consilio atque opera fuisse, et aliquamdiu ibi commoratum esse, ut illa ab Ipso Deo audiret, . . . quæ mundo mox annunciaturus,” &c.; going on to instance the case of Moses. *Id.*, *ibid.*, § De Ascensu, et Commoratione Christi hominis in cœlo, antequam munus Suum in terris obire inciperet; *ibid.*, p. 675. a. (So also in his *Explicationes Loc. S. S.*, *ibid.* p. 146. b. And Slichtingius, *In Joan.* iii. 13. *Comment. Posthuma*, p. 27. b. *Irenop.*

1656. And see Pearson, *On the Creed*, vol. i. p. 196. ed. Burton.)—“Quædam quæ ad Ipsius Christi personam aliqui pertinent, . . . non naturalia Illi sunt, sed a Deo postmodum Ipsi data et concessa: et sic ad Dei voluntatem sunt referenda. . . . Quænam sunt ista? Divinum imperium quod in nos habet, et suprema illa majestas, quæ quidquid usquam est aut excogitari potest, præter unam tantum Ipsius Dei majestatem, longe excellit. Hæc enim Christo haud naturalia esse, sed a Deo Patre Illi data fuisse, Ipsumque ea per et propter mortem atque obedientiam et resurrectionem Suam adeptum esse, apertissime Scriptura testatur.” *Id.*, *ibid.*, § De Cognitione Christi; *ibid.*, p. 653. b. “Scriptura voluit, firmissime ac perpetuo nostris mentibus hæere, Christum non a Seipso sed a Deo, ut nostra peccata expiandi, . . . sic etiam nos qualibet alia in re juvandi nobisque subveniendi potestatem habere,” &c. *Id.*, *ibid.*, § De Interpellatione Christi pro nobis; *ibid.*, p. 668. a.—“Christum Sibi Ipsi meruisse,” but “nobis nihil omnino (si de vero merito loquamur) vel meruisse vel mereri potuisse,” and this because as man He was for Himself bound to obey the law of God; is the argument of the De Christo Servatore, P. III. c. v.; *Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 202. b, sq.

<sup>n</sup> See above, § 3. note j.



tion to stand upon, could it be made good. But for the truth hereof, there being no cause why I should swell this book with those things that have been said already, I will remit the reader to Jansenius his Augustin<sup>o</sup>; where he shall find what remains in the records of the Church: how the Pelagians went about to join with the Nestorians, and to make our Lord Christ to have purchased His Godhead by the actions and behaviour of His human nature; and how in this regard they remain involved in the condemnation of Nestorius at the council of Ephesus. Though, whereas the beginning of this error is there ascribed<sup>p</sup> to Origen, it is easy to observe a vast difference between this pretence and that conceit which is found at present in his books *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* (but whether resolutely delivered by him may be questioned),—that the human soul of Christ was chosen by God for the Word to be incarnate in, in consideration of that which it had done in the other world<sup>q</sup>. For this supposes the Godhead of Christ before His incarnation, and the truth of it; which Socinus his opinion (to which these relations make the Pelagians to have inclined) destroyeth. And so it is manifest, that according to Socinus there can be no such thing as the grace of Christ, according to Pelagius there is not. But that which is common to both, proceeds upon a supposition common to

CHAP.  
X.

<sup>o</sup> The title of this celebrated book is, Cornelii Jansenii Episcopi Iprensis Augustinus seu Doctrina Sancti Augustini de humanæ naturæ sanitate, ægitudine, medicina; adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses. The first volume (in the folio edit., Paris. 1641) treats De Hæresi Pelagiana; and lib. vi. c. 6. pp. 146. 2—148. 1, entitled “Christum volunt ex meritis liberi arbitrii factum esse Deum: haustus ille error ex Origene,” collects the evidence connecting Pelagianism with Nestorianism.

<sup>p</sup> “Si rem a capite accersere lubet, nemo expressius, quod sciam, hæresim illam tradidit, quam totus Pelagianismus fons Origenes. Nam in libris *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*,” &c. Jansen., *ibid.*, p. 147. 2.

<sup>q</sup> “De anima Christi multiplex fuit Origenis error; ac multiplex quoque adversus eum Patrum querela et criminatio. Sententia illius hæc est, quantum ex ejus scriptis licet intelligere: animam Christi cum animabus hominum reliquis longe ante corpora a Deo procreatam; liberoque itidem ut alias

instructam arbitrio, cum eximio Auctoris sui amore præ cæteris animabus teneretur, similisque aliarum per naturam, Verbi similis esset per virtutem, tam firmiter Ei sese applicuisse, ut tota ab Eo recepta, vel totum recipiens, idque substantialiter, unus cum Eo Spiritus efficeretur,” &c. Huet., *Origeniana*, lib. ii. c. iii. § 6. The Benedictine editors however add in a note, that “quoniam ex lib. ii. De Princip. cap. vi. ubi ea de re fusius disserit, plurimi concludunt sensisse Origenem animam Christi, cum a Deo una cum cæteris creata esset, optimo liberi arbitrii usu consecutam esse ut cum Verbo hypostatice conjungeretur, locus ille paulo accuratius examinandus est;” and proceed at length to prove, that Origen’s real sentiments were, not “humanitatem Christi . . . sanctitate consecutam esse ut cum Verbo conjungeretur hypostatice, sed hac hypostatica conjunctione inconvertibiliter sanctificatam Unigeniti gloriæ et nominis esse participem.”

BOOK  
II

both;—that man is presently in the same state of free will in which he was created<sup>r</sup>; that the fall of our first parents did no harm to their posterity<sup>s</sup>; neither can their children that are baptized be baptized into the remission of sin, when they have none of their own<sup>t</sup>: though, for Socinus his part, he laughs at the baptizing of infants<sup>u</sup>, who allows the baptizing of men that have sinned themselves, but as a ceremony of indifference<sup>\*</sup>; which Pelagius, though he be content to allow and require, yet not to the purpose of remission of sin in infants<sup>v</sup>. Now the Church of God, in which the baptism of infants hath been practised ever since the times of the Apostles, always understood the Gentiles (that had been left to

<sup>r</sup> “Ex iis quæ supra disputata sunt, satis constare potest, in homine liberum arbitrium esse; si modo id verum est, quod omnes concedunt, et ratio ipsa manifeste docet, in primo homine ante lapsum liberum arbitrium fuisse. Nulla enim causa est, cur propter lapsum eo privari debuerit.” Socin., *Prælect. Theol.*, c. v.: *Op.*, tom. i. p. 541. b.—For the Pelagians, see Voss., *Theses Theol. et Hist.*, De Hær. Pelag. Disp. i. Thes. 2.

<sup>s</sup> “Concludimus igitur, nullum, improprie etiam loquendo, peccatum originale esse; id est, ex peccato illo primi parentis nullam labem aut pravitatem universo humano generi necessario ingentam esse, sive inflictam quodammodo fuisse; nec aliud malum ex primo illo delicto ad posterum omnes necessario manasse quam moriendi omnimodam necessitatem.” Socin., *Prælect. Theol.*, c. iv.; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 541. a: and see the whole chapter. So also Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. v. c. xviii. pp. 547 sq.—“Pelagiani putabant peccato Adami præter Adamum læsum neminem:” proved by Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. ii. P. ii. Thes. 2.

<sup>t</sup> “Quid quod, dum ad infantes baptismum transtulerunt, id quod in baptismo Apostolico præcipuum est, et (ut in Scholis loquuntur) formam ejus constituit, sustulerunt. Id vero est, quod ii qui baptizantur, externo hoc ritu testantur se sordes peccatorum abluere et puritatem vitæ sectari in posterum velle.” Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. vi. c. xiv. p. 668. See also above, c. v. § 10. note g: and for Pelagius, below note y.

<sup>u</sup> “Dixi, . . . me ad scandalum et offensionem vitandam aquæ baptismum suscepturum fuisse, nisi vulgo ab istis

pro baptizato haberer, nempe propter baptismum illum quem infans in Patu accepi; qui quamvis non sit verus nec legitimus aquæ baptismus, tamen ab ipsis esse creditur. . . . Hoc quidem non est infantium baptismum confirmare sed potius quantum in me est evertere. . . . Veruntamen, cum mihi aquæ baptismus non videatur necessarius iis qui ex Christianis, id est, Christum profitentibus nascuntur et in ea professione parentes imitantur; atque ita nihil revera referre arbitrer, nisi propter scandalum, utrum isti necne, et an potius adulti quam infantes, baptizentur, propterea non diffiteor me circa infantium baptismum haud difficilem futurum,” &c. Socin., *Epist. ad Sophiam Siemichov.*; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 432. b.

<sup>\*</sup> “Te obtestatus sum ut . . . considerare velles, . . . si aquæ baptismus, quemadmodum ego asserebam, res indifferens esset, quam gravis esset error ecclesiæ vestræ, quæ onus hoc aqua baptizandi fratribus imposuisset.” Socin., *Epist. ad Simon. Ronenberg.*; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 429. b. And see above, c. i. § 7. note r: and Voss., *De Bapt.*, Disp. vii. § 5 sq.

<sup>v</sup> “Pelagius, ne fateretur obstringi (infantes) originali peccato et nasci æternæ mortis reos, negabat eos per baptismum accipere remissionem originalis delicti vel de potestate tenebrarum in regnum Dei transferri:” proved by Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. ii. P. ii. Thes. 4.—“Hilarius his verbis mentem eorum” (scil. Pelagianorum) “exprimit: ‘Infantem non baptizatum, morte præventum, non posse merito perire, quoniam sine peccato nascitur.’” Id., *ibid.*



themselves to fall away to the worship of idols) to be wholly under the power of Satan, by virtue of that advantage which CHAP. X.  
 69 he had of our forefathers; and the Jews, who had retired themselves to the worship of one true God, so little able by that law to withdraw themselves from under sin, that few of them were vouchsafed God's Spirit. Acknowledging therefore all this to proceed from the leaven of the first sin, they acknowledged the necessity of Christ's coming for the cure of it, the sufficiency of the cure in His Godhead from everlasting, and the obedience of our flesh, wherein It was incarnate<sup>2</sup>.

§ 7. This being the state of the dispute, it appeareth, that the intent which I propose, obligeth me not to dispatch without maintaining the eternal Godhead of our Lord Christ; though not so as to consider the whole controversy of the Holy Trinity, but only that of the Person and Natures of Christ, how far it is declared to us by the Scriptures and original tradition of the Church: knowing nevertheless, that this being resolved, the rest of the controversy concerning the Holy Trinity necessarily falls to the ground of itself, as having nothing whereupon to subsist when the everlasting Godhead of Christ is once maintained afore. Now the ready way that I can think of to go through so great a dispute as briefly as is possible, is to take in hand first the point of original sin; in which the dispute between Pelagius and Socinus on the one side, and the Church on the other side, is grounded. For therefore, I hope, it will appear the shortest way to dispatch the whole dispute; because, that being decided (together with that which dependeth upon it, as incident to it, concerning the state of our Lord Christ before His coming in the flesh), the rest will appear to consist, either in controversies of divines, or in mistakes and disputes about words.

§ 8. I begin with St. Paul; because he it is, who, having laid forth the necessity of Christianity to the salvation as well of Jews as of Gentiles in the beginning of his Epistle to the Romans, and in the fourth chapter by the example of Abraham confirmed the same; or, if you please, answered The opposition between the first and second Adam in St. Paul,

\* See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. II. peccato originali crediderit, et cur ita  
 P. i. : "quæ quid Ecclesia Vetus de senserit, exponit."

## BOOK

## II.

evidenceth  
original  
sin.

["For that  
all have  
sinned."  
Eng. vers.  
—"In  
whom."  
Ibid. in  
margin.]

[Gen. ii.  
17.]

the objection concerning the salvation of the fathers before and under the Law; proceeds in the fifth chapter to lay forth, both the ground upon which it is effectual, which is the death of Christ, and the ground upon which it was necessary, which is the sin of Adam. Thus then saith St. Paul, Rom. v. 12—14: "Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all, in whom all sinned: for until the Law sin was in the world; now sin is not imputed where there is no law; and yet death reigned from Adam until Moses, even upon them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that is to come." It is said, that the words, "*ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*," are to be translated "inasmuch as all had sinned;" to signify, that spiritual death came after Adam upon all that had sinned as Adam did, inasmuch as they had sinned<sup>a</sup>. For as for bodily death, they<sup>b</sup> believe not, no more than Pelagius, that it was the punishment of Adam's sin, but the condition of man's birth. Only the troubles, the cares, the sorrows, by which men come to their graves, these, as they acknowledge to be consequences, as of Adam's sin, so of all those sins whereby men follow and imitate Adam, so they think to be meant by the sentence, "In the day wherein thou eatest thereof shalt

<sup>a</sup> "Rejicienda igitur penitus est interpretatio ista, quæ non aliter ea verba *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον* explanat, quam si dictum fuisset, In quo homine omnes peccaverunt . . . et ea sine ulla cunctatione amplectenda, quam et universæ orationis structura et usitata significatio, apud sacros præsertim scriptores, verborum *ἐφ' ᾧ* . . . aut omnino requirit aut certe minime aspernatur" (scil. pro quatenus vel eo quod vel quandoquidem). "Mens igitur Apostoli . . . in priore hac suorum verborum parte est, quod quemadmodum per Adamum actuale et verum peccatum in mundum intravit (id est, ut ipso peccandi initium, in mundo, est factum . . .) et per peccatum mors, unde factum est ut in omnes homines mors pervaserit, quatenus (vel eo quod) omnes peccaverunt; sic per Christum actualis et vera obedientia," &c. Socin., De Jesu Christo Servatore, P. IV. c. vi.; Op., tom. ii. p. 223. b. And repeatedly elsewhere. See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. II. P. i. Thes. 2: and below, § 10.

<sup>b</sup> "Concludimus . . . ex primo illo delicto ad posteros omnes necessario manasse . . . moriendi omnimodam necessitatem: non quidem ex ipsius delicti vi, sed quia cum jam homo natura mortalis esset, ob delictum illud suæ naturali mortalitati a Deo relictus est, quodque naturale est, id in delinquentis pœnam necessarium est factum." Socin., Præl. Theol., c. iv.; Op., tom. i. p. 541. a.—"Homo ante lapsum, quamvis natura mortalis esset, non tamen morti erat penitus et necessario obnoxius; sed Divina gratia a morte in perpetuum servari poterat. Post lapsum vero omnino necessarium est ut semel moriatur, quemadmodum scribit auctor ad Hebr. ad finem cap. 9." Id., Ad Argum. F. Puccii Respons., § vi.; Op., tom. ii. p. 200. a.—"Pelagianorum dogma erat, mortem temporalem esse ex necessitate naturæ nec propter peccatum primorum parentum redundasse in genus humanum." Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. II. P. ii. Thes. 3.



thou die the death<sup>c</sup>." But this is no less than to deny the literal sense of the Scripture, which the Church hath received for one of Origen's errors<sup>d</sup>, in the interpretation of the beginning of Genesis. What is it else to say, that Adam was liable to bodily death by nature but to spiritual death by sin? For it is manifest by the premises, that through all the Old Testament the second death is no otherwise preached, than under the figure of the first death; and that, by virtue of the ground laid from the beginning, that the covenant of grace, which tendereth life and death everlasting, was only intimated under the covenant of nature (which the Law only received, and limited to the happiness of the land of promise, as to the Israelites), tendering expressly only blessings and mercies of this life to the civil and outward obedience of God's commandments. And can it be imagined, that in the very first tender that God made to man, of life in consideration of obedience, and death of disobedience, this life and this  
70 death must be understood to be the second, when the obedience was only in abstaining from the forbidden fruit?

§ 9. What was then that fruit of the tree of life, by eating whereof they might have preserved themselves from death? [The tree of life.]

I ask not what it signified, but what it was. For all reason will require, admitting the premises, that it signified that whereby the soul escapes spiritual death: but the same reason will enforce, that it must be the fruit of a tree; which, so long as they eat not of the tree of knowledge, they were licensed to eat, to preserve them from bodily death. Neither is there any difficulty in that they ask, how all the posterity of Adam should have come by the fruit of that tree, that grew no where but in the garden of Eden. For I suppose it had been as easy to have planted all parts of the world with the same tree as with the posterity of Adam, had he continued in obedience: who, being not driven out of Eden

<sup>c</sup> "Si sacræ historiæ verba ipsa exacte perpendere velimus, et ad ea explananda Pauli Apostoli interpretationem, de qua infra agendum erit, non adhibere; per comminationem illam (Gen. ii. 17), licet in ea mortis expressa mentio fiat, mortem tamen ipsam vere Adamo decretam non fuisse, sed tantummodo mala destinata, quibus in hac vita propter peccatum hominem

perpetuo circumdatum esse voluit Deus, manifestissime apparebit." Socin., Ad Argum. F. Puccii Respons., § vi.; Op., tom. ii. p. 200. a. And so Crellius, Resp. ad Hug. Grotii De Satisfactione Christi, Resp. ad c. i. Partic. 67; p. 83. Racov. 1623.

<sup>d</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 28. note i, and § 51. note y.

BOOK  
II.

(as upon his disobedience), but sending his posterity to do that in the rest of the world which he did there, had made all the world Eden, by placing the paradise of God wheresoever innocence dwelt. In this case, I see not why any man should take care for the tree of life, that no posterity of Adam might die. No more, then, what should become of that innocent posterity; which, when it had so planted the world, the counsel of God concerning the propagation of mankind may well be thought to have been come to ripeness. The Socinians indeed do allege Josephus; who, speaking of the tree of life, doth not say, that it should have made man immortal, but only, that "it should have made him live to very great years<sup>e</sup>." But that is of no consequence; in regard that it is not expressed in the Scripture, that God would have had man live everlastingly upon the earth, had he lived in obedience. For supposing that it was a question among the Pharisees<sup>f</sup> (to which sect it appears Josephus inclined most<sup>g</sup>), whether so, or whether God would translate them to a heavenly life after a time of obedience here (which, to the Pharisees, that acknowledge the resurrection and the world to come, must needs seem credible enough); it is no marvel, that Josephus should say, that by virtue of the tree of life they had 'lived to a very great age;' though, in case [they had<sup>h</sup>] not [been<sup>h</sup>] translated, they might as well have lived always by virtue of it.

§ 10. But let us hear St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22: "For since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead; for as by Adam all died, so by Christ shall all be made alive." Is there any rising from bodily death but by Christ? I say not any rising, in the quality of those in whom the Spirit of Christ dwelleth; of whom St. Paul saith,

<sup>e</sup> Joseph., *Antiq. Jud.*, lib. I. c. ii. § 4. (Op., p. 6. ed. Hudson)—quoted by Crellius, *Resp. ad Hug. Grot.*, De Satisfact. Christi, *Resp. ad cap. i. Partic.* 73. p. 91.—specifies among the blessings lost by the fall, the absence "πόρου καὶ τάλαιπωρίας, ὧν παρόντων γῆρας τε ἂν ἐπέλθοι καὶ τὸ ζῆν οὐ μακρὸν ὑμῶν γένοιτο." Volkel also (*De Vera Relig.*, lib. III. c. xi. p. 68) argues, that "vocem æternitatis seu mavis sæculi, quæ Hebraice est *Olam*, sæpe non ab-

solutam, sed naturæ rei illius, qua de agitur, accommodatam perennitatem durationemque longissimam declarare;" applying the remark to interpret Gen. iii. 22. And Socinus likewise (*Ad Defens. F. Puccii Respons.*, c. v.; Op., tom. ii. p. 298. b).

<sup>f</sup> See Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, liv. IV. c. xii. § 17, 18; liv. v. c. xix. § 13 sq.

<sup>g</sup> Vit. Josephi, § 2; Op., p. 905.

<sup>h</sup> Added from MS.



that "He, Who raised Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies through His Spirit dwelling in you;" CHAP.  
X.

Rom. viii. 11. But, setting aside this quality, it is the coming of Christ, and His trump, that raiseth again, even those that shall rise to judgment. And can it for all this be doubted, whether that life was lost by Adam's fall, which the rising of Christ shall restore? And supposing that Christ raises only "those that are Christ's," as St. Paul speaks, it is their bodies that He raises at last; and that, from that death

[1 Cor. xv. 23.]

which came by Adam. Seeing then it cannot be doubted, that St. Paul, when he says that "by one man came death," means the death of the body; and seeing "death passed upon all;" it is manifest, that Adam's sin passed upon all, upon

[Rom. v. 12. 17 :  
1 Cor. xv. 21.]

whom the death passed which it brought after it. For otherwise, how can it be said, "sin came into the world by one man?" Is it possible to imagine, that all men should propose to themselves to imitate the sin of Adam<sup>1</sup>? Not possible. Supposing all Adam's posterity sinners to God, they may be understood all to have imitated their first father Adam two ways. For inasmuch as they sin against God as he first did, they may be said to imitate him in doing the like of that which he did; though they had no knowledge of what he did, much less propose to themselves his example, to do that wherein they are said to imitate him, in sinning against God. This I confess may truly be said, but not to St. Paul's purpose: who intends not to say wherein sin consists, as to say in doing what Adam did; but from whence it proceeds, that from thence he may shew how it is taken away. Now if it be said, that all men in sinning do imitate Adam, as proposing

71 his example to themselves in the nature of a motive; so that therefore it might be said, that "sin came into the world by one man and death by sin," which the Apostle's discourse requires; this would be evidently false: inasmuch as the greatest part of the sins of mankind are and have been committed by them that never knew what Adam did, so far from proposing to themselves to do the like. So that it cannot be

<sup>1</sup> "In Adam peccasse omnes, non propter peccatum nascendi origine attractum, sed propter imitationem, dictum est." Pelagius, Lib. de Natura;

ap. Aug., Lib. de Natura et Gratia, c. ix. § 10; Op., tom. x. p. 131. C. And see Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. II. P. ii. Thes. I.

BOOK  
II.[Eng. vers.  
in text,  
"for that;"  
in mar-  
gin, "in  
whom."]

avoided, that by the sin of Adam all sin came into the world, as well as all death. And, therefore, "ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον" seemeth to signify, "in whom," that is, "through whom, all have sinned;" as Acts iii. 16, "Ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος Αὐτοῦ"—"through the faith of His name;" 1 Cor. viii. 11, "Ἀπολείται ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει"—"shall perish through thy knowledge." For if it be said<sup>k</sup>, that it is not a handsome manner of speech, that "ἐφ' ᾧ"—"in whom" should relate to "δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου"—"by one man," which it stands in such a distance from; let him be sure, that there is nothing more ordinary in St. Paul's language than such transpositions. And seeing death, which I have shewed the Apostle speaks of, hath equally passed upon all mankind, it would be very impertinent to say, that it passed upon all men, 'inasmuch as every man had sinned,' or 'so far as every man had sinned.' And truly, though "ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον" may signify in Greek 'inasmuch as all had sinned,' or 'because all had sinned,' to wit, in Adam; by the same reason as οὐ ἕνεκα, or οὖνεκα in the language of the poets, signifies the same (as in the beginning of Homer,

"Οὖνεκα τὸν Χρῦσιν ἡτίμησ' ἀρητήρα  
'Ατρείδης<sup>l</sup>");

<sup>j</sup> "Ἐφ' ᾧ (in quo) hic est per quem, quomodo ἐπὶ cum dativo sumitur Luc. v. 5, Act. iii. 16, 1 Cor. viii. 11, Heb. ix. 17. Chrysostomus hoc loco, 'Ἐκείνου πεσόντος καὶ οἱ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου γεγονάσι παρ' ἐκείνου πάντες θνήσκει' (Illo labente, et ii qui de ligno non comederunt, per eum omnes mortales facti sunt)." Grotius ad loc.

<sup>k</sup> "Quatenus omnes peccaverunt." Erasmus ad Rom. v. 12; who defends the translation at length in his note.—So also Calvin translates, "Quandoquidem omnes peccaverunt."—"Non habetur eo loco 'in Adamo omnes peccasse;' cum nec verborum ordo, Adamo longe ante nominato et in proxime præcedentibus non subaudiendo, nec particula Græca ἐπὶ qua Paulus utitur, eam interpretationem ferat. Quare verba illa, quæ nonnulli interpretes reddunt 'in quo,' reddi debent (ut a quibusdam etiam factum est) 'quatenus' vel 'quoniam' vel 'eo quod.'" Catech. Racov., c. x. De Lib. Arbit. p. 159. ed. 1680.—So also Socinus repeatedly; see above, § 8. note a.—

"Hæc postrema verba ['quoniam omnes peccaverunt'] referre ad unum illum hominem, cuius fit mentio in prima parte versus, nimis contortum est ac violentum: id enim quæ sunt interjecta non patiuntur. Nec refert quod alibi in scripturis exempla ejusmodi ὑπερβάτου seu trajectionis inveniuntur. Tunc enim solum eo confugere licet cum ex usitata constructione verborum absurdus aliquis sensus et reliquis Scripturis minus consentaneus oritur, qui vitandus sit." Curcellæus, Dissert. Secunda de Peccato Origin., § xxiv.; Op., p. 899. Amstel. 1675.—"Debere autem verba ista eo quo diximus modo" (scil. quatenus vel eo quod) "hoc in loco accipi, ipsa verborum structura convincit; utpote quæ inepta aut nulla plane esset si istæ duæ voces 'in quo' ita essent accipiendæ ut ad 'hominis' vocabulum superius commemoratum referrentur," &c. Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. V. c. xxi. p. 567.

<sup>l</sup> Hom., Iliad., i. 11, 12.



yet it seems to me evident, that the sin which St. Paul speaks of, when he says, that "through the disobedience of one man sin came into the world and death by sin," is the sin that every man does in the world: and, therefore, when it followeth, "*ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*," the meaning must be, through whom all men have sinned those sins which themselves do. For seeing there was mention of "one man" afore, by whom sin came into the world, it is more reasonable, that "*ἐφ' ᾧ*" should be personal, relating to that one man through whom all have sinned, than real, to signify "because all had sinned." And so it is not said by these words, that all Adam's posterity did commit the sin of Adam in his committing of it; but it is said, that all the sin that Adam's posterity commits, comes by the means of Adam's sin: that is, original sin is not expressly but metonymically (not formally but fundamentally) signified; in that all sin is affirmed to come from that of Adam, and evidenced also, in that death is said to come by it.

§ 11. That which hath been said, makes me stand astonished to see a doctor of the Church of England acknowledge no further signification of the Apostle's words—"As by one man sin came into the world and death by sin, and so [death] passed upon all, in whom all have sinned,"—but this,—that Adam sinned first, and so all his posterity after him: so that "by one man sin came into the world," because, coming upon all, it must needs "come first upon the first;" not because his sin had any influence upon others to cause their sins<sup>m</sup>. For seeing Pelagius, whom it concerned so much to maintain that Adam's sin did no harm to his posterity, having made it the ground of his heresy, could not nevertheless put off the force of these words without a shift of imitation, though so pitifully lame, that it could not reach the far greater part of his posterity; it may justly seem strange, that he who pretends

CHAP.  
X.

Dr. Taylor<sup>m</sup>.

[Rom. v. 12.]

<sup>m</sup> Added in margin in MS.

<sup>n</sup> Misprinted "sin" in folio edition.

<sup>o</sup> "By one man sin came into the world." That sin entered into the world by Adam, is therefore certain, because he was the first man; and unless he had never sinned, it must needs enter by him; for it comes in first by

the first." Jeremy Taylor, Doctrine and Practice of Repentance, c. vi. sect. 1. § 7: Works, vol. ix. p. 2. ed. Heber. And compare his longer comment on the same text, in his *Deus Justificatus*, Works, vol. ix. pp. 351, 352. The subject is discussed at length below, c. xx. § 35 sq.

BOOK  
II.

not to go any thing so far as Pelagius, should not allow that sense of them which Pelagius could not refuse. But if he oversee that, which obliged Pelagius to grant that they intend to set forth the means by which sin came into the world, the observing of it will be enough to exclude his device. For—to let pass that which is peremptory in them, the comparison between the first and second Adam (by Whom this doctor will not deny the righteousness of Christians to come otherwise than as the first righteous, whatsoever Pelagius<sup>p</sup> or Socinus<sup>p</sup> do), because I cannot void that issue in this place,—the very process of St. Paul's dispute, having first convicted both Jews and Gentiles of sin, then (chap. iv.) shewed how that faith which he preached promiseth righteousness, requireth us to understand, that he comes now to set forth, by what means this sin on the one side and this righteousness on the other comes into the world. Neither will the words 72 of the text be so satisfied; wherein we find the same sense repeated in divers expressions, which are not all capable of that equivocation, whereof these words, “by one man's disobedience,” are. For St. Paul saith not only “δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου”—“by one man,” but (according to the reasons premised) “ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον”—“through whom all have sinned,” and “τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι”—“by” (that is, “through) the transgression of that one,” and “κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα”—“judgment to condemnation out of one;” besides, on the other side, “δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι”—“the gift through grace:” Rom. v. 12, 15, 16. And this shall serve, for the present, to shew how unable this conceit is to stand against the evidence of the words: reserving that which is most peremptory in the matter, and the consequence of it, till I come to shew that our Lord Christ, the second Adam, is the means of our righteousness; and, therefore, by that

<sup>p</sup> “Solent (Pelagiani) dicere nobis in eo Christum ad non peccandum præbuisse adjutorium, quia juste Ipse vivendo justeque docendo reliquit exemplum.” S. Aug., De Gratia Christi, c. ii. § 2; Op., tom. x. p. 231. A. And so also cc. xxxviii. § 42, xxxix. § 43, xli. § 45; *ibid.*, pp. 247. C. G., 248. F.—See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. III. P. ii. Thes. 3.—“Mens igitur Apostoli . . . est, quod quemadmodum per Adamum

actuale et verum peccatum in mundum intravit (id est, ab ipso peccandi initium in mundo est factum), . . . sic per Christum actualis et vera obedientia in mundum intravit (id est, ab Ipso Divinæ voluntati ea ratione obediendi, qua hoc tempore jubemur, in mundo initium est factum).” Socin., De Jesu Christo Serv., P. IV. c. vi.; Op., tom. ii. p. 223. b.



likeness of reason which St. Paul's discourse proceeds upon, the first Adam the means of our sin<sup>a</sup>. CHAP. X.

§ 12. And to this purpose speaketh that which followeth. For when the Apostle argueth, that "whereas sin is not imputed when there is no law, notwithstanding death reigned upon all those that had not sinned as Adam did;" that is, by transgressing such an express law of God as Adam did transgress (observing that the fathers, who walked with God, Whom Adam offended, tasted nevertheless of that death which Adam incurred); he inferreth to us, that the effect of Adam's sin remains in the whole kind of his posterity, to which death, the punishment thereof, belongeth. [Rom. v. 13, 14.]

§ 13. And, I beseech you, of whom speaketh St. Paul but of all mankind, when he writeth thus, Rom. vii. 5—13. "For when we were in the flesh, the passions of sin which were by the Law were exercised in our members, to bear fruit unto death; but now are we voided to the Law, that being dead by which we were held, that we may [serve<sup>r</sup>] in the new spirit, not in the old letter. What shall we say then? Is the Law sinful? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the Law. For I had not known concupiscence, had not the Law said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking advantage by the commandment, wrought in me all concupiscence. For without the Law sin was dead. Now I lived sometime without the Law. But, the commandment coming, sin revived, and I died. And that commandment which was for life, to me was found to death. For sin, taking advantage by the commandment, deceived me, and slew me by it. So the Law is holy; and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Did then that which was good, become death to me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, wrought me death by that which was good; that sin by the commandment might become sinful above measure." For though St. Paul's speech here be concerning a Jew, in the person of one that of a Jew was become a Christian; yet, seeing the proposition of the Apostle bears, that the Gentile is much more involved in that condemnation to which the Jew is liable, that which belongs to every Jew that comes to Christianity, will be true much more *a fortiori* Concupiscence in the unregenerate, and the inability of the Law to subdue it, evict the same.

<sup>a</sup> Below, c. xviii. § 1 sq.

<sup>r</sup> Misprinted "live" in folio edition.

BOOK of the Gentile, all mankind being then completely divided  
II. into Jew and Gentile.

[Whether St. Paul in Rom. c. vii. speaks in the person of a regenerate or an unregenerate man.]

§ 14. And, therefore, let no man think, that my present purpose shall engage me, before I can make use of this Scripture, to decide the question now on foot among divines; whether St. Paul here speaks in the person of an unregenerate man or regenerate: which, notwithstanding, in another place I may be engaged to decide\*. For the present, it is enough for my turn, that an unregenerate man, admitting St. Paul, cannot refuse his own case to be that which St. Paul here sets forth to be [his<sup>t</sup>]; that, being "in the flesh, the passions of sin were exercised in" his "members," and so forth. For I know it is said, that "to be in the flesh" is to be in "the custom of sin<sup>u</sup>:" but what difference makes that in the case, when all to whom the Gospel first comes are in the flesh; excepting those, who under the Law, though not by the mere Law, came to that state of grace in which the fathers stood? And therefore it is to me of no consequence, whatsoever the meaning of the Apostle may be, when he describes those sinful passions which he saith were exercised in their members, to be those that were "through the Law."

§ 15. I see there are two opinions of his meaning, when he saith afterwards, that sin, "getting advantage by the commandment" (without which it was dead, but the man alive; and "when it came, sin revived and he died:" so that "the Law, which tendered life, became to his death, because sin by advantage of the Law slew him deceitfully"), "wrought in him all concupiscence." For one opinion says<sup>v</sup>, that when an

\* Below, c. xxxi. § 29.

<sup>t</sup> "this," in folio edition.

<sup>u</sup> "Habit<sup>us</sup> peccandi," &c. "nil est aliud quam peccandi consuetudo. Quæ quidem varie a divinis auctoribus exprimitur. Jam enim simplici verbo Peccandi effertur; . . . jam denique (servi peccati) non secundum spiritum sed secundum carnem ambulare dicuntur." Volk<sup>el</sup>, De Vera Relig., lib. IV. c. xxiii. p. 352.—Hammond (on Rom. vii. 5, viii. 8): "While we were in the flesh," i. e. "while we lived under the pædagog<sup>y</sup> of the Law."

<sup>v</sup> "Multi interpretes ἀφορμὴν exponunt occasionem; putantque idem hic dici quod vulgari proverbio, Nitimur in vetitum." Grot. ad loc.; who inter-

prets the passage differently himself: as does Hammond (ad loc.) also,— "Cupiditas ipsa prohibitionē lacessitur, ut appetitus vini in febricitante ex interdicto medici accenditur: cujus causa est naturalis amor libertatis quæ per legem restringitur, cui proinde natura corrupta resistens in contrarium nititur." Estius and others, ad loc., ap. Poli Synops.—"Detexit in me omnem concupiscentiam: quæ dum lateret quodammodo nulla esse videbatur. Neque tamen inficior quin acrius a lege exstimuletur caro ad concupiscendum atque etiam hoc modo se in lucem proferat . . . Sed quod de manifestatione dixi, contextui videtur magis convenire." Calvin, ad loc.; Op., tom. vii.



unregenerate man becomes convict, that the law of God takes hold of his inward inclinations, which he finds to be evil, the inbred corruption of nature, not submitting thereto upon this mere conviction, flies out into utter defiance of God and His Law, in all disobedience to it, whereby the concupiscence that is opposed may be satisfied. The other saith<sup>w</sup>, that, the Law of Moses in the outward and literal sense thereof requiring only civil obedience, answerable to that temporal happiness which it tendereth, it is no marvel that Jews, being tied to the letter of the Law as their study and business, should think the outward and civil observation thereof to be the utmost intent of it; which we see, to this day, to be the error that detains them from Christianity: and, therefore, it is properly said, according to this opinion, that "sin, taking" this "advantage by the Law, slew me by deceit." But to me this dispute is of no consequence: or, rather, both opinions are to be admitted, in relation to the two several senses of the Law, which I have advanced<sup>x</sup>. For as to the literal sense of the Law (which the Gentile could have nothing to do with), it is manifest this might be. For it is manifest, that it is become a scandal to the Jew; to make him think that he stands right in God's court without any Gospel of Christ, and thereupon to induce him to defy it. But as to the spiritual sense of the Law (in which the Gentile also hath his interest, as concerning things written in the hearts of all men), whatsoever the occasion is, by which it becomes revived in the heart in which at any time it may have been dead (because it neither gives rule to the actions thereof, nor binds it over to judgment); most certain it is, and most evident the meaning of St. Paul, that when it cometh to convict a man of his duty, and by consequence what he is liable to upon the

[Rom. vii.  
11.]

p. 45. And so also Beza, ad loc.—  
"Hinc autem factum est, ut homo, lege lata, videns concupiscere sibi non licere, quod antea non videbat, multo magis ad concupiscendum (propria tamen culpa) impulsus fuerit, adeo ut omni cupiditate post legem latam plus quam ante fuerit repletus. Nam cum lex non est, peccatum (ut ita dicam) non irritatur, et propterea vires suas non exerit, sed quodammodo mortuum est." Socin., Explic. Epist. ad Rom. c. vii.; Op., tom. i. pp. 89. b, 90. a.

<sup>w</sup> "Cum (Lex) immortalis vitæ bonorumque cœlestium spem atque amorem hominum animis non insereret; contra autem bona terrena et carni grata toties tamque apertis verbis inculcaret: carnem non modo repressit, sed etiam illius vim ac desideria quodammodo auxit et incendit." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. II. c. xxi. p. 35: quoting in the margin Rom. vii. 14, viii. 5.

<sup>x</sup> Above, cc. v. § 10. note b, vii. § 12—17, ix. § 15.

BOOK  
II.[Ecc. xii.  
14.]

failure, the Law, that is for life, will prove to death : that is, if grace help not, sin will overcome. For if the help of the Law, convicting of one true God, His providence and judgment, even upon the secrets of the heart, were not able to reclaim those that were bred under it to spiritual righteousness ; much less shall that conviction, whereby the light of nature evidences the same, be of force to the same purpose.

§ 16. And this is that which St. Paul intimates, Rom. viii. 3, 4: "For whereas the want of force in the Law was weak through the flesh, God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and concerning sin, condemned sin in the flesh ; that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, that walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit." For if the doctrine of Moses' law (which, as I have shewed<sup>y</sup>, giveth so really eminent advantages towards the choice of true righteousness) was uneffectual to the Jews, by reason of the flesh ; of necessity the light of nature must needs become uneffectual to the Gentiles, in the same regard of the flesh : which is therefore the common principle, by means whereof true righteousness can take no place without the Gospel of Christ, neither in Jews nor Gentiles. And, therefore, that which follows in St. Paul's discourse, Rom. vii. 14—[25] (leaving for the present the dispute, how far it takes place in the regenerate), in all opinions must take place in the unregenerate, upon a principle common to all mankind ; which is this, that as "the law" of God "is spiritual," so man is "carnal," and by consequence "sold under sin." For in whom there is a contradiction to the law of God, and that righteousness which it requireth of man, from the inward motions of the heart, so soon as the understanding becomes convict that this it requireth ; in him there is, unquestionably, a principle of rebellion against God, for something that he is inclined to desire for himself, without and against all respect of God. Now, by the process of St. Paul's discourse, all Christians that admit St. Paul must allow, that it supposeth such a principle in all that come to Christianity, whether or no it infer the like in those that are already come to it ; to wit, 74 not to do what they like but what they hate, and, approving the law to be good that forbids it, to do the evil which they

<sup>y</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xii. § 8 sq.



would not do, not the good which they are willing to do: so that, though there be a law of God which in their judgment they approve, yet there is another law in their members, which prevails against it, to captive them to the law of sin. Which law (be it "the custom of sin" as much as you will, provided that this custom have passed over all mankind, all that the Gospel is tendered to<sup>a</sup>), seeing it is the choice of no man, no nation, but common to Adam's posterity, it must needs be derived by propagation from his sin; whom his posterity, not knowing, could not purpose to imitate.

CHAP.  
X.

§ 17. The words of St. Paul, Gal. v. 16, 17, are to the same purpose:—"Now I say, walk in the Spirit, and fulfil not the desires of the flesh; for the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are opposite to one another, so that ye may not do that ye would." For supposing the same dispute, whether they be meant of Christians or of the unregenerate; at least, when Christianity is tendered, when men are exhorted to embrace it, then is there in man a principle opposite to that, which the Spirit of God, bringing the Gospel, and brought by the Gospel, requires: and that infers the same consequence as before.

[So Eng. vers. in marg. "Ye shall not fulfil," in the text.]

§ 18. But I must not forget the passage of St. Paul, Ephes. ii. 1—3: "And you, being dead in trespasses and sins, in which once ye walked, according to the age of this world, according to the ruler of the dominion of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom all we also conversed once in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of our flesh and thoughts, and were by nature the children of wrath as the rest also." For I must observe, that Paul, writing to a Church of Gentiles converted to be Christians, [being himself converted to be a Christian of one that was a Jew before<sup>a</sup>,] first concludeth the Gentiles to be under the power of Satan; and then, lest it should be thought that the Jews (of whom himself was one) were invited to be Christians upon other terms, he inferreth of them, that

[*"aîwra"*—"course;" Eng. vers.]

<sup>a</sup> "Though I grant it to be the custom of sin which St. Paul complains of, yet, seeing that all mankind to whom the Gospel is preached must complain of it as he doth"—Substituted in the

MS. for the words "be it the custom . . . tendered to."

<sup>a</sup> Substituted in the MS.—"himself of a Jew," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

"we also, among them" (Gentiles), "were by nature children of wrath:" where it is plain, that St. Paul, having expressed the sins of the Gentiles, in which he saith they were "dead," and having equalled the Jews to them for walking according to their lusts, cannot possibly be understood to speak of the common birth of all men, when he saith "we were by nature the children of wrath as well as others<sup>b</sup>." Whosoever shall peruse Epiphanius, a Christian writer, but in such a style as those that were not bred to the learning and elegance of the Greeks' language may be supposed to use (and therefore much resembling the style of the Apostles, and of very good use for them who would inwardly be acquainted with their language), he shall find this word φύσει very ordinarily used by him, not to signify (as commonly it doth) "by nature," or "by birth," but "truly" and "really." Which signification how well it suits with the words of St. Paul, when he saith, "We" Jews "were φύσει—really the children of wrath, as also the rest," that were Gentiles<sup>c</sup>; let any man that can judge of learning, judge. So, I insist not upon this word φύσει, but upon St. Paul's discourse. And upon the ground hitherto persuaded I argue, that, Jews as well as Gentiles being thus concluded under the necessity of the Gospel, which is the grace of Christ, the ground of it can be no other than the corruption of all the posterity of the first Adam, which only the second Adam can cure.

The second birth by the Holy Ghost evidenceth, that the first birth propagateth sin.

§ 19. I come now to our Saviour's instruction to Nicodemus, when, of a doctor of the Jews, he became first a disciple of Christ, John iii. 3, 5[—7]: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Unless a man be born again" (that is, "of water and of the

<sup>b</sup> "Filius natura, est Filius naturalis, proinde verus. Itaque Filii naturæ, sunt Filii veri iræ." Slichtingius, Comment., in Epist. ad Ephes. ii. 3; tom. ii. p. 153. a. And see also Grotius ad loc.

<sup>c</sup> "Φύσει [natura] significat non opinione sed revera, ut Galat. iv. 8. ἀληθῶς, γνησίως [vere, revera], ut hic habet Œcumenius. Nec aliter Theophylactus. Syrus, מליאית, plene, omnino; quomodo et Hieronymus ait a veteribus acceptum." Grotius, ad Ephes. ii. 3.—"Ὅθεν γὰρ πονησὶ καὶ ἡ θεία γραφή, καὶ ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, τὸ φύσει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῶς

λαμβάνονσα." Cyril. Alex., Explan. XII. Capit., In Anathem. iii.; Op., tom. vi. p. 149. D. Paris. 1638.—"Ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, καὶ ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, οὐ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαίνονμενον τῆς φύσεως λέγει, ἐπεὶ τοῦ Ποιήσαντος ἀνὴρ ἦν τὸ ἐγκλημα· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἔμμενον καὶ κακίστην διάθεσιν, καὶ χρονίαν καὶ πονηρὰν συνήθειαν." Suidas, sub voce φύσις; p. 3864. E. ed. Gaisford.—See Suicer, Thesaur.; and Schleusner; sub voce φύσις. So also the Socinian Crellius, ad loc. That φύσει is occasionally used in classic Greek for λίκαν, see Abresch, Lectt. Aristænet., p. 64.



Holy Ghost), he cannot see" (or "enter into") "the kingdom of God: that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit: marvel not that I said to thee, ye must be born again." And to the same effect St. John himself, speaking in his own person of our Lord Christ, John i. 12, 13: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the children of God, to wit, to those that believe in His name; who were not born of bloods, or of the will of the flesh, . . but of God." In these words I acknowledge a very considerable difficulty; though, perhaps, it is not that which most men do forecast: <sup>75</sup> but I, that do maintain<sup>d</sup>, that the baptism of Christ was not instituted when these words were said, having said already, that the baptism of Christ is that to which the promise of remission of sins is allowed, must needs find it hard to answer, what our Lord meant when He said, "Unless a [John iii. 5.] man be born of water and of the" Holy "Ghost." For if the sacrament of baptism were not then instituted when our Saviour spake these things to Nicodemus, how shall we say, that original sin is signified by these words, wherein there is no mention of the cure of it? Surely, upon the ground afore settled<sup>e</sup>; that the second birth is by the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost given in consideration of the profession of Christianity by being baptized. For, this being settled, it may remain questionable, what Nicodemus could then understand by the name of water; but it cannot be questionable, that there is no regeneration without the Holy Ghost, and no Holy Ghost without that condition upon which the gift of the Holy Ghost is due, that is, without baptism. To answer this question then, which we are thus secured that it cannot be answered to the prejudice of the Church, and the faith thereof; it will be worth the while to compare the discourse of our Lord to the company that followed Him to Capernaum, in the sixth of John, with this to Nicodemus. For no man can be so unreasonable as to imagine, that the sacrament of the eucharist was instituted by our Lord at the time of that discourse, or by virtue of it; of the institution whereof we have so due account in the Gospels, before the suffering of our Lord. And yet it would

CHAP.  
X.<sup>d</sup> Above, c. ii. § 8.<sup>e</sup> Above, c. ii. § 7 sq.[John vi.  
32—58.]

BOOK  
II.

be a strange thing to imagine, that all that long discourse of our Lord should have no relation to that sacrament: especially seeing it is so agreeable to all reason, that our Lord should deliver unto His disciples the effect of His Gospel, in such terms as suited best with the ceremony of that sacrament, wherewith He intended to establish the same. For, supposing the eating of the flesh of Christ crucified, and the drinking of His blood, to be the consideration of His passion, tending to a resolution of taking up His cross, we have in it the sum of Christianity; consisting in the bearing of Christ's cross, that is, in conforming ourselves to His sufferings. Report we this to the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus; and it will seem strange to me, that any man should marvel, that when the sacrament of baptism was not yet instituted, our Lord should propose His Gospel to him upon this ground, that no man "born of the flesh" could "attain to the kingdom of God" without being "born again of water and the" Holy "Ghost:" seeing that, whether he understood or not what our Lord meant by water, it is enough, that the Spirit, which reneweth the old birth of the flesh, dependeth upon that which it signifies, whatsoever it is. Whether Nicodemus, for the understanding of our Lord, betake himself to the consideration of the several baptisms of the Law, or to the baptism of John the Baptist, or to the baptism by which proselytes were made Jews (which divers learned men have both declared and alleged to the clearing of this difficulty<sup>f</sup>, to very good purpose): certain it is by the premises, that the condition of salvation is the profession of Christianity by baptism; that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not promised upon any other terms; therefore, the sacrament of baptism being instituted, there is no assurance of salvation without it, where the precept thereof takes place; therefore, the first birth of the flesh is liable to original sin.

<sup>f</sup> Hammond (in Joh. iii. 10; and Six Queries, Inf. Bapt., § 6—19, Works, vol. i. pp. 608—610); Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr., in Matt. iii., Works, vol. ii. pp. 116 sq.); Selden (De Sy-

nedriis, lib. i. c. 3; Op., tom. i. p. 792; De Jure Nat. et Gent., lib. ii. c. 4; *ibid.*, p. 191). See Poli Synops. ad Joh. iii. 10; and Wall's Hist. of Inf. Baptism, Introd., vol. i. pp. 3—33.



## CHAPTER XI.

THE OLD TESTAMENT CHARGETH ALL MEN AS WELL AS THE WICKED TO BE SINFUL FROM THE WOMB. DAVID COMPLAINETH OF HIMSELF AS BORN IN SIN, NO LESS THAN THE WISE MAN OF THE CHILDREN OF THE GENTILES. HOW LEVITICAL LAWS ARGUE THE SAME. AND TEMPORAL DEATH UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT. THE BOOK OF WISDOM. AND THE GREEK BIBLE.

BUT it is requisite that we look into the Old Testament, to see what arguments of the same will discover themselves there: provided that we be advised not to expect the reasons, upon which the necessity of the Gospel is grounded, clearly expressed there, where the Gospel itself is but intimated. Those that will not admit the faith of the Church without such proofs as themselves require, may, with the Jews, disbelieve the Gospel, if our Lord will not prove it by such miracles as they would have, and when and where they would have them done. But, admitting the truth of Christianity upon such reasons as God hath made effectual to subdue the world to it, it will be consequently necessary, that there should be arguments of original sin in the Old Testament, but darker than those which have been and shall be propounded out of the New.

§ 2. Certainly it deserveth much consideration, that Moses saith (Gen. vi. 5), "And the Lord saw that great was the evil of man upon earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil all the day long." And again, Gen. viii. 21, upon smelling Noah's sacrifice, God "saith to Himself, I will no more curse the earth for man, because the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." For, first, God declares Himself as a severe judge, to take vengeance upon the sins of mankind by the deluge, because the world was overflowed with sin; and afterwards, either for the same reason (because sin cannot be washed out, no, not with the waters of a deluge, so long as mankind is in being upon the earth), or notwithstanding it, He declares, that He "will curse the earth no more for man's sake." Here it will be impossible to render a reason of that deluge of sin

[What kind of evidence for original sin in the Old Testament.]

The Old Testament chargeth all men as well as the wicked to be sinful from the womb.

BOOK  
II.

(which first brought a deluge of waters, but could not overcome God's goodness for mankind), without a principle common to all mankind. Such variety there is in their fancies, such contrariety in the inclinations which they produce; that it is impossible that they should agree in mischief, were they merely of God's making. And therefore Solomon, having premised a hard word for women,—that, “seeking account one by one,” he had “found a man of a thousand, but a woman of all these” he had “not found,”—inferreth, Eccl. vii. 29, “Only this, behold, I have found, that God made man right, but they have found out many devices.” Where I suppose he summoneth all men to infer, that, between the uprightness in which God made man, and the many crooked devices which they have found out to themselves, there must something have fallen out to create a common principle, to which those many inventions may be imputed. But the act of Adam, which passed away so soon as it was done, had it left nothing behind it, could have borne the blame of itself alone, and of nothing else.

[Eccl. vii.  
27, 28.]

§ 3. When God commandeth the Israelites to put a fringe upon the corners of their garments, He giveth this reason for it, Num. xv. 39; “And ye shall see it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them; and not look after your hearts, and your eyes, after which ye commit whoredom.” Surely, when He sets the lusts of their eyes and the imagination of their hearts in opposition to the commandment of God, He justifies the words of our Lord (Matt. x. 36, taken from the prophet, Mic. vii. 6) to be fulfilled in every man's heart; “A man's enemies are those of his own house.” And Solomon's taunt to the young man, Eccl. xi. 9; “Walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee to judgment:”—God's complaint by the prophet, Ezek. vi. 9; “I am broken with their whorish heart, 77 which hath departed from Me, and with their eyes, which go a whoring after their idols:”—leadeth us (for the reason and ground of both) to that of the Apostle, 1 John ii. 16; “For whatsoever is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father but of the world.” But what is there between God and the



world, but the old serpent, and the leaven which he hath poisoned man with? And this is that venom which we read of, Psalm lviii. 4—6 [Hebr.]: “The wicked are estranged from their mother’s womb; as soon as they are born, they go astray and speak lies; they have venom like the venom of a serpent, like the deaf adder that stoppeth his ear; that will not hear the voice of the enchanter, that enchant with charms cunningly.”

CHAP.  
XI.

[vv. 3—5.  
Eng. vers.]

§ 4. For if it be said, that all this speaks only of the wicked, which of their own choice have addicted themselves to sin, and that by being bred to it by their fathers and predecessors, and so debauched from their own natural innocence; I shall presently appeal to David himself, and his confession, with which he pretends to grace<sup>g</sup>, Psalm li. 7, 8 [Hebr.]: “Behold, I was formed in wickedness, and in sin did my mother conceive me; but, behold, Thou requirest truth in the entrails, and shalt make me to understand wisdom secretly.” I know it is said<sup>h</sup>, that this is nothing but a hyperbolical expression of the prophet; whereby he chargeth himself with sin, even before he could understand what sin was, and that from the time of his conceiving in the womb, were that possible, he hath been liable to sin, and so left without mercy. And to this purpose is alleged that of the Pharisees to the blind man, John ix. 34,—“Thou wast wholly born in sin, and dost thou teach us?”—to argue, that among the Jews it was an ordinary expression to aggravate a man’s sin, by saying that ‘he was born in sin<sup>i</sup>.’ And, truly, what the Jews of that

David  
complains  
eth of him-  
self as born  
in sin.

[vv. 5, 6.  
Eng. vers.]

<sup>g</sup> “With which he comes to God, pretending to find grace by making it.” Substituted in MS.

<sup>h</sup> “Satis constare potest figuratum esse istum loquendi modum (Ps. li. 7) atque hyperbolicum; ut illum etiam Psal. lviii. 4, ‘Abalienati sunt impii a vulva, erraverunt ab utero loquentes mendacium.’ Similis locus est Esaiæ xlviii. 8: quibus loquendi modis peccata exaggerantur et efficacius vituperantur. Quanquam verisimile est Davidem potius ad excusandum peccatum suum ita locutum esse, et in humana fragilitate commemoranda hyperbole ista fuisse usum, quasi peccatum homini res quædam plane naturalis sit, non autem quod ita sit revera.” Socin., Prælect. Theol., c. iv.; Op., tom.

i. p. 541. a.—“Sensus est, *Non nunc tantum, sed et a pueritia mea, sapius peccavi.* Est enim loquendi genus *ὑπερβολικόν* [superjectivum]. . . Occasione hujus gravis criminis meminit et antecedentium quamlibet non tam gravium.” Grotius, ad Psalm. li. 7.—So also Slichtingius, Comment., in Joh. ix. 34; tom. i. p. 78. b: Smalzius, Refut. Thes. Franzii, De Pœnitent. § 3, p. 354: Volkelius, as in next note; and Socinian commentators generally.

<sup>i</sup> “Hic vero ad illa Davidis verba confugient, ‘Ecce in iniquitate,’ &c. “Verum ne hinc quidem peccatum originale constitui potest. Vel enim hæc proprie a Davide vel figurate dici volumus. Si proprie intelligenda, quo jure ad omnes refertur id quod David

BOOK  
II.

time might conceive of the coming in of sin, is not altogether so clear; in regard of the Apostles' words to our Lord upon the occasion of the same man, when they asked our Lord whether he was 'born blind for his own sin, or for the sin of his parents?' John ix. 2. Which our Lord answering, for neither, but for a particular intent, of shewing a particular work of God upon him, denies not the common taint of our nature, when He affirms, that particular works of providence upon particular persons have particular reasons and ends, for which God will have them come to pass; but shews, that there were several opinions in vogue at that time through the nation, and that there might be a conceit of men's souls sinning in other bodies, or before they came into these bodies, according to the position of Pythagoras<sup>k</sup>, or the conjecture of Origen<sup>l</sup> (though the opinion of Herod concerning John the Baptist, that he should be alive again in our Lord, Matt. xiv. 2, doth not appear to proceed from any such presumption as this, but from an imagination that dead men's souls might come and live again in the world, whether in the same or other bodies). From this opinion, then, the reproach of the Pharisees to this man, that he was "born in sin," may well seem to proceed. And their error will not prejudice the truth, that all men are indeed born in sin.

No less  
than [St.  
Paul and]  
the Wise  
Man, of the  
children of  
the Gen-  
tiles.

§ 5. But I observe further, that the people of God, as they were totally divided from the worship of idols, so, from the consequences thereof; which Paul, in the first of the Romans, sheweth to have been all sorts of uncleanness in the first place, and then the rest of those evils, which towards the end of the chapter he qualifies the Gentiles with. For it is manifest, that uncleanness which contained no civil injustice was counted but an indifferent thing with all the Gentiles. Let

sibi soli tribuit? . . . Si vero per aliquam dicendi figuram prolata sunt, quo pacto quæso hinc peccatum originale concludi potest? Cum isto loquendi genere uti soleat Scriptura ad exaggerandam hominis alicujus malitiam atque impietatem, cui ita sit immersus ut ei videatur innata. Cujus rei exempla habes Psal. lviii. 4, Esai. xlviii. 2. 8, et xlix. 1, et Joan. ix. 34." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. V. c. xviii. p. 551.—"In peccatis natus es." Locutio est hyperbolica quæ significat aliquem

a prima ætate vitiorum fuisse: Psal. li. 5, lviii. 3, Esai. xlviii. 8. Et Chrysostomus ad hunc locum, "Ὁσαυτὲ ἐλεγον, Ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἐν ἁμαρτίαις εἶ σὺ." Sic et aliæ res quæ nobis a pueritia adfuerunt, dicuntur ab utero adfuisse; Psal. xxii. 9, 10, lxxi. 5, 6; Job. xxxi. 18." Grot., ad Joh. ix. 34.

<sup>k</sup> Diog. Laert., lib. viii. § 4. See Grotius ad Joh. ix. 2.

<sup>l</sup> See Huet., *Origeniana*, lib. II. Qu. vi. § 17—20.



him that would be satisfied of this, peruse what the Wise Man hath said of the seed of the Gentiles, which he compareth with the Jews whom they persecuted, all along his whole work: Wisdom iii. 12—[19]; iv. 1—6. Where it is manifest, that he setteth forth the posterity of the Gentiles as defiled with the uncleanness wherein they were bred and born. And this is most certainly the reason, why St. Paul saith of Christians married to Gentiles, 1 Cor. vii. 14; “For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, 78 but now are they holy:” to wit, that a heathen husband or wife, consenting to dwell in wedlock with a Christian, is sanctified by a Christian husband or wife, by whose means he is brought to this engagement. (For when St. Paul adviseth the Christian party to continue in wedlock contracted with an idolater before Christianity, he presupposeth, that the Gentile shall be willing to forbear the vulgar uncleannesses of the Gentiles, for the love of a Christian yoke-fellow. Otherwise it could not be honest, nor for the reputation of a Christian among the Gentiles, having power of divorcing—as both parties had in the Roman empire,—to continue in wedlock with him, that acknowledged not Christian, but only civil, wedlock; that is, the wife to be tied, in regard of the issue, but the man free to all uncleanness, which the Roman laws no way restrained.) And, therefore, their children so far from being unclean, according to the manners of heathen parents, that they are holy; upon presumption that they shall be bred in the instruction of Christianity, by the means of that party which was Christian<sup>m</sup>.

§ 6. I observe again, that the prophet David, speaking of his wicked enemies (the figure of the Jews, whom thereby he designeth aforehand to be the enemies of our Lord and His Church), applieth the same expression to them (being of the

[Ill sense  
of the word  
Gentiles,  
in David.]

<sup>m</sup> “Recte interpretantur hic et Syrus et Latinus: ‘Si uterque esset idololatra, liberi vestri essent immundi,’ id est, פסולים, profani, quia educarentur in cultum idolorum Deo displicentem. ‘Jam vero liberi vestri sunt כשרים recti, mundi, Deo grati,’ quia Deus ad educationem liberum opitulatur parti meliori. Cujus exemplum habemus in Timotheo. . . Tertullianus de Anima:

‘Hinc enim et Apostolus ex sanctificato altero sexu sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis prerogativa quam ex institutionis disciplina.’ . . . Hieronymus quoque ad quæsitâ Paulini intelligit sanctos dici liberos, ideo quod candidati sint fidei, nati et educati extra inquinamenta idololatriæ.” Grot., ad Epist. 1 ad Corinth. vii. 14.

BOOK  
II.

[Ps. lviii. 3.] carnal people of God, but far from Jews according to the spirit), which the people of God other whiles use concerning the Gentiles; when he saith, that they "are estranged from the womb," and "as soon as they are born, go astray and speak lies." For it is manifest, that he calls them גוים, Psalm

[Ps. lix. 5, 8. Eng. vers.] lix. 6, 9 [Hebr.]; which, by the title, appears to be written of the Jews his enemies<sup>n</sup>: and so, Psalm xlii. 2°. Which word commonly stands in as ill a sense with the Jews, as ἔθνη, *gentes et nationes*, to the Christians; not for people, λαοί, עמים or לאמים, but for Ethnics or Gentiles, that is to say, idolaters<sup>p</sup>. And so to this day the Jews call us Christians גוים; that is to say, Gentiles<sup>q</sup>. And upon these observations I am induced to believe, that the Pharisees, and those of the consistory (out of the confidence they had of their own holiness, which they presumed of upon the curiosity which they kept the Law with), did judge of those that pretended not to the same, as of people once removed from Gentiles, and so sinners from their birth, by the grossness of those manners in which they were bred. But when David comes to confess

[Ps. li. 5.] of himself, that he was altogether born in sin, and conceived by his mother in wickedness; it is not possible, that any such reason should take place: but rather such a one, as may make good whatsoever can be attributed to the Spirit of God, speaking of God's own people in the mouth of David. And without doubt, as idolatry was the original of the most gross customs of sin, as appears by the premises, so can there be no greater argument of the corruption of man's nature, than the departure of all nations from the worship of one true

<sup>n</sup> "To the chief musician, . . Mich-tam of David; when Saul sent, and they watched the house to kill him."—"Vocabulum גוים est generale, et quum de gentibus in universum usurpatur, tum etiam (de quo dubitare non debebant nonnulli interpretes) de Israelitis; ex. gr. Jes. i. 4, ix. 2, xxvi. 2, xlix. 7; Gen. xii. 2, xxxv. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 12." Gesen. in voc.

<sup>o</sup> This reference is certainly wrong. It ought probably to be Ps. xliii. 1. (in LXX, xlii. 1); "Judge me, O God, and plead my cause against an ungodly nation" (גוים, ἔθνος): of which Psalm Absalom's rebellion appears to have been the occasion.

<sup>p</sup> "In Plur. vero גוים specialiter di-

citur de (reliquis) gentibus præter Isra-ëlem, . . sæpe annexa notione hostium et barbarorum, . . vel profanorum, a vera religione alienorum. . . Nonnunquam opponitur. גוים, גוים, quo de Israële libentius utuntur. . . LXX satis constanter גוים reddunt λαός, ἔθνος, Vulg. gens; unde etiam in N. T. τὰ ἔθνη opponuntur τῷ λαῷ Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Luc. ii. 32)." Gesen. in voc.

<sup>q</sup> "גוים Gens: Homo gentilis. Sic Judæi quemvis vocant qui non est de populo Israel, maxime tamen Christianis hoc nomen dedere. Nam Turcas appellant Iismeelim sive Ismaëlitas." Buxtorf, Lexic. Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinic., sub voce.



God to the worship of they knew not what. That all nations, coming of one blood, from one God, Which at their first apostasy was so well known to them, and not able to blot out of their own hearts the conscience of the service they owed Him, should imagine themselves discharged of that obligation by tendering it to what they pleased (saving a small part of mankind, whom He reserved to Himself, by making them acquainted with Himself through the familiarity which He used them with), if all other arguments of a common principle of corruption in our common nature were lost, is enough to make the apostasy of our first forefathers credible, which the relation of Moses makes truth. Wherefore, when David attributes to himself by nature that which the people of God attribute to the Gentiles, it must needs be understood in regard of a principle common to both, which the grace of God suffereth not to come to effect but preventeth in His people. And when he attributeth the same to his malicious enemies, Jews only by the first birth, he warranteth us to say the same of those that are Jews by the second birth, so far as the birth of both is the same.

§ 7. I will not forbear to allege here the law of Leviticus, that appoints a time of impurity for women that have brought forth; as no less fit to signify the evil inclination to which our nature by the fall of Adam is become liable, than the ceremonies of the Law are fitly used by God to shadow the truth of the Gospel. Not that I make any doubt, that this impurity of itself is but legal; as the impurity contracted by touching a dead man, or a living creature that was unclean, or that of the leprosy, or by the custom of women, or the like: which, I am resolved, amounts to no more than an incapacity of freely conversing with God's people, or an obligation to a sacrifice, which is there called *חַטָּאת*, or *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, because it purged this incapacity, which in regard of that positive law may be called "sin." But this being granted, and these legal incapacities being, by the correspondence of the Law with the Gospel, to signify the cause for which men are incapable of heaven: as the leprosy of the body, and the touching of a dead man, or a living creature that is unclean by the Law, necessarily signifieth that incapacity, which cometh by the custom of sin; so that unclean-

CHAP.  
XI.  
How Levitical laws argue the same.

[Levit. xii.]

[Levit. xii. 6.]

BOOK  
II.

ness, which ariseth from those things which come from our own bodies, seemeth, by necessary correspondence, to signify that incapacity of coming to heaven, which ariseth from the inward inclination of our nature to wickedness.

And temporal death  
under the  
Old Testament.

§ 8. Neither will I omit to allege the saying of the prophet David, alleging the reason of God's compassion to His people in their sins to be their mortality. Psalm lxxviii. 39; "For He considered that they were but flesh, and even as a wind, that passeth away and cometh not again." And Psalm ciii. 14—17: "For He knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust: the days of man are as of grass; as the bud of the field, so springeth he: for a wind passeth upon it, and it is not; and the place knoweth it no more: but the goodness of the Lord is from generation to generation upon them that fear Him, and His righteousness upon children's children." For having shewed, that the bodily death to which Adam was sentenced implied in it spiritual death, and supposed the same according to St. Paul, I may well say, that he could not express that reason which Christians allege to God for His compassion upon their infirmities, more properly to the time and state of the Law, than by alleging the death which our bodies are subject to, as an argument of sin which it is allotted to punish. And the antithesis which follows, between our short life and the continuance of God's mercies to His servants of their posterity, comes correspondently to set forth the grace of the Gospel, though sparingly signified as under the Law.

The Book  
of Wisdom.

§ 9. And here I must not forget the Wise Man's exhortation, Wisdom i. 12—[16]: "Affect not death through the error of your life, nor purchase destruction through the works of your hands: for God made not death, nor taketh pleasure in the destruction of the living; for He made all things to endure; and the beginnings of the world were healthful, and no deadly poison among them, nor any dominion of hell upon the earth (for righteousness is immortal): but the wicked with their words and works purchased it; and thinking it their friend, decayed, and made a covenant with it, because they are worthy to be on the side of it." Here it is evident, that the speech is of temporal death, but so that by it is intimated spiritual death; according to that which hath oft been



observed, and will oft come to be observed, that the mystery of Christianity, intimated in the Old Testament, begins more plainly to be discovered in these books than in the canonical Scriptures<sup>r</sup>. And, therefore, though the purchase of death is attributed to the evil words and works of the wicked, yet, seeing it hath taken place over all the world, contrary to the first institution of God, thereby he leaves us to argue the corruption of nature, which moveth mankind to take pleasure in those works by which death takes place.

§ 10. Last of all, I will allege, not the authority of the book of Job, which is not questionable, but the authority of the Greek translation of it. Be the author thereof who may be, be the authority thereof what it may be, it is manifest how ancient it is, and that it came from the people of God while they continued the people of God, and hath passed the approbation of the Apostles<sup>s</sup>. When therefore it is said, that “no man is clear of sin, no, not the infant of one day old upon earth<sup>t</sup>,” it remaineth manifest, that this was the sense of the then people of God. As it appears also by Philo: “Ὅτι παντὶ γεννητῷ, καὶ σπουδαῖον ᾗ, παρ’ ὅσον ἦλθεν εἰς γένεσιν, 80 συμφύεῖς τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν ἐστίν”—“That to sin is a property [that is<sup>u</sup>] born with all that are born, in as much as it is come to birth<sup>v</sup>.” And divers sayings of the heathens might be alleged<sup>w</sup>, as obscure arguments of that truth which the Gospel is grounded upon; but that I conceive the disorders

CHAP.  
XI.

And the  
Greek  
Bible [in  
its trans-  
lation of  
Job].

<sup>r</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Princ. of Chr. Truth, c. xxxi. § 14—44.

<sup>s</sup> “De ætate Græcæ (Jobi) versionis hoc tantum certum est, Philonis temporibus vetustiorē esse, a quo citatur” (see note t, below). Hody, De Bibl. Text. Orig., lib. II. c. ix. § 6. p. 196. Others however, e. g. Walton (Proleg., c. ix. § 11. pp. 58, 59), maintain, that the LXX translated the whole of the canonical Scriptures.—For the Apostles, 1 Cor. iii. 19, James iv. 14, contain quotations from the book of Job, but not from the Septuagint version. James v. 11. merely alludes to his history.

<sup>t</sup> “Τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἐστὶ ἀπὸ ῥύπου; ἀλλ’ οὐθεὶς, ἐὰν καὶ μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.” Job xiv. 4, 5. LXX: quoted by Philo, De Nomin. Mutat., Op., tom. i. p. 585. ed. Mangey. “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one. Seeing his days are determined,” &c. Job, *ibid.*, Eng. Vera.

<sup>u</sup> Added from MS.

<sup>v</sup> Philo, De Mose, lib. iii. ; Op., tom. ii. p. 157. See Grot., De Jure Belli et Pacis, II. xx. 19.

<sup>w</sup> “Virgilianum illud excute, ‘Nusquam tuta fides.’ Aut Ovidianum, ‘Qua terra patet, fera regnat Erinnyes: In facinus jurasse putes.’ Aut illud Menandri—(quis enim non in hoc magnitudinem ingenii sui concitavit, detestatus consensum humani generis tendentis ad vitia?)—Omnes, ait, malos vivere: et in scenam velut rusticus poeta prosiluit. Non senem exceperit, non puerum, non foeminam, non virum: et adjicit non singulos peccare nec paucos sed jam scelus esse contextum.” Seneca, Nat. Quæst., lib. iv. Præfat.; Op., pp. 884, 885. Paris. 1607. And see the passages collected in Le Clerc, Comment. ad Genes. vi. 5: and in Vitringa, Obserrv. Sacræ, lib. III. c. xii. § 8; tom. i. p. 665. Franeq. 1712.

BOOK of the world, the greatest whereof that can be named is that  
 II. which I named even now, of the worship of idols, are greater  
 and more evidences of the same than any sayings of writers :  
 which therefore it will not be requisite to heap into this  
 abridgment.

## CHAPTER XII.

THE HERESY OF SIMON MAGUS THE BEGINNING OF THE Gnostics. THAT  
 THEY WERE IN BEING DURING THE APOSTLES' TIME. WHERE AND WHEN  
 THE HERESY OF CERINTHUS PREVAILED, AND THAT THEY WERE Gnostics.  
 THE BEGINNING OF THE ENCRATITES UNDER THE APOSTLES. IT IS EVI-  
 DENT, THAT ONE GOD IN TRINITY WAS THEN GLORIFIED AMONG THE  
 CHRISTIANS, BY THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD WHICH THEY INTRODUCED  
 INSTEAD OF IT.

[Order of  
 the argu-  
 ment.]

I SHOULD have propounded that evidence for original sin  
 which is drawn from the necessity of the grace of Christ, be-  
 fore that which is drawn from the Old Testament, had it not  
 been for that exception which the Socinians make to it, by  
 questioning the state of our Lord Christ before His coming  
 in the flesh ; in regard whereof, I hold it the shortest course  
 to void this issue. first, and then see what witness the neces-  
 sity of the grace of Christ renders to original sin. And be-  
 cause that tradition of historical truth, which remains in the  
 records of the Church, evidences that meaning of the Apo-  
 stles' writings which I shall advance ; I shall not make dif-  
 ficulty to propound, in the first place, some things upon  
 undeniable record in the fathers, that may serve to argue  
 the intent of the Apostles in this point.

The heresy  
 of Simon  
 Magus the  
 beginning  
 of the  
 Gnostics.

§ 2. I say then, that it is a thing undeniable to common  
 sense, that, what time the Apostles writ, there were divers  
 heresies in being, whether openly divided from the Church,  
 or lurking within it under the common profession, to get  
 opportunity to pervert the simple, and, in fine, to withdraw  
 them from the Church. The first whereof was that of Simon  
 Magus<sup>\*</sup> : who, being discovered by the Apostles to have only  
 counterfeited himself a Christian, to get the power of doing  
 those miracles which the Apostles did, that he might draw

[Acts viii.  
 9—24.]

\* For the sense in which it "is as-  
 serted with one consent by all (the  
 fathers) that Simon Magus was the  
 parent and founder of all heresies,"

see Burton, Bampton Lectures, Lect.  
 ii. p. 29, and Lect. iv. pp. 87 sq. : and  
 the authorities quoted by him in Notes  
 38, 39, pp. 365—369.



followers after himself, fell away from Christianity; to declare himself among the Samaritans (who expected the Messiah no less than the true Jews), to be the Christ, Whom the Apostles preached our Lord Jesus to be. But withal it is certain, that he taught his disciples, that he alone could reveal unto them God, Whom their fathers knew not; for that the world had been at first made by angels, in opposition to Him; who also gave the Law, and brought in among men the difference between good and bad; which he, by that knowledge of God which he professed, undertook to teach how men should become free from, and by this freedom attain the fellowship of God in the world to come. It cannot then be said, that the author of this heresy continued any longer in the Church: because, when St. Peter says to him (Acts viii. 22, 23), "Repent thee of this thy malice, and beseech God, if perhaps this device of thy heart may be forgiven thee; for I see thou art in the gall of bitterness and

CHAP.  
XII.

[John iv.  
25.]

7 Irenæus's account of Simon's tenets is as follows. "Hic" (Simon Magus) "a multis quasi Deus glorificatus est, et docuit semetipsum esse, qui inter Judæos quidem quasi Filius apparuerit, in Samaria autem quasi Pater descenderit, in reliquis vero gentibus quasi Spiritus Sanctus adventaverit: esse autem se sublimissimam virtutem, hoc est, Eum Qui sit super omnia Pater. . . Helenam quandam, quam ipse a Tyro civitate Phœnices quæstuarium cum redemisset, secum circumducebat, dicens hanc esse primam mentis ejus conceptionem, matrem omnium, per quam in initio mente concepit angelos facere et archangelos. Hanc enim Ennoiam exilientem ex eo, cognoscentem quæ vult pater ejus, degredi ad inferiora et generare angelos et potestates, a quibus et mundum hunc factum dixit. Posteaquam autem generavit eos, hæc detenta est ab ipsis propter invidiam, quoniam nollent progenies alterius ejusdem putari esse. Ipsum enim se in totum ignoratum ab ipsis: Ennoiam autem ejus detentam ab iis, quæ ab ea emissæ essent potestates et angeli; et omnem contumeliam ab iis passam, uti non recurreret ad suum patrem, usque adeo ut et in corpore humano includeretur et per sæcula veluti de vase in vas transmigraret in altera muliebria corpora. . . . Quapropter et ipsum venisse, uti eam assumeret primam et li-

beraret eam a vinculis, hominibus autem salutem præstaret per suam agnitionem. Cum enim male moderarentur angeli mundum, quoniam unusquisque eorum concupisceret principatum, ad emendationem venisse rerum et descendisse eum transfiguratum et assimilatum virtutibus et potestatibus et angelis, ut et in hominibus homo appareret ipse cum non esset homo; et passum autem in Judæa putatum, cum non esset passus. Prophetas autem mundi fabricatoribus angelis inspiratos dixisse prophetias: quapropter nec ulterius curarent eos hi qui et in eum et in Helenam ejus spem habeant, et ut liberos agere quæ velint: secundum enim ipsius gratiam salvari homines sed non secundum operas justas. Nec enim esse naturaliter operationes justas sed ex accidenti; quemadmodum posuerunt qui mundum fecerunt angeli, per hujusmodi præcepta in servitum deducentes homines. Quapropter et solvi mundum, et liberari eos qui sunt ejus, ab imperio eorum qui mundum fecerunt, repromisit." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 20; pp. 24. b, 25. a, b. ed. Grabe.—See also Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 21: Op., tom. i. pp. 55 sq.—Theodoret, Hæret. Fab., lib. i. c. 1; Op., tom. iv. pp. 191. B.—193. B. Paris. 1642.—And Burton, Lect. iv. pp. 105—109, Notes 46, 47. pp. 388—393.

BOOK  
II.[Acts viii.  
24.]

the bond of unrighteousness;" though he answer, "Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of the things which you have said come upon me;" yet<sup>z</sup> we find not, that his after behaviour deserved that he should be admitted to penance and reconciliation with the Church<sup>a</sup>. And when he declared himself to be the Christ (as did after him his disciple Menander,—witness Irenæus<sup>b</sup>, Epiphanius<sup>c</sup>, and Theodoret<sup>d</sup>,—when, he being dead and gone, his pretence appeared vain), then was he of necessity at defiance with the Church and all Christians. But this must be said (which upon the<sup>81</sup> faith of historical truth is averred by the same witnesses<sup>e</sup>), that of him, and the seeds of his doctrine, came afterwards many sects; the authors whereof, not pretending themselves to be the Christ, pretended all to make known God, otherwise unknown, to their disciples, and by that knowledge to save them in the world to come, through abandoning them to all licentiousness in this: which sects were therefore called by the common name of Gnostics, or "knowers;" though there was one of those sects, which had no other particular name besides<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>z</sup> Corrected from MS. "for," in orig. text.

<sup>a</sup> For the state of the evidence respecting the well-known story of Simon's death, see Burton, Note 41. pp. 371—374.

<sup>b</sup> "Menander . . ait . . se eum esse qui missus sit ab invisibilibus salvatorem pro salute hominum." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 21. p. 96. a.—See below, § 17; and Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ix. § 24.

<sup>c</sup> "Ἐαυτὸν δὲ ἔλεγε (Μένανδρος) δύνανται ἄνωθεν Θεοῦ καταπεπέμφθαι," κ.τ.λ. Epiphan., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 22. § 1; Op., tom. i. p. 61. A.

<sup>d</sup> "Ἐαυτὸν δὲ οὐ τὴν πρώτην ἀνόμασε δύναμιν ἄγνωστον γὰρ ἔφησε ταύτην ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐκείνης ἀπεστάλθαι βρενθύμενος, σωτήρα ἑαυτὸν προσηγόρευσε." Theodoret, Hær. Fab., lib. i. c. 2; Op., tom. iv. p. 193. C.

<sup>e</sup> "Omnes qui quoquo modo adulterant veritatem et præconium Ecclesiæ lædunt, Simonis Samaritani magi discipuli et successores sunt." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 30; p. 105. a.—"Καὶ οὕτως" (i. e. from Simon Magus) "ἄρχεται τῶν Γνωστικῶν καλουμένων ἢ ἀρχή." Epiphan., Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 21. § 4; Op., tom.

i. p. 58. D.—"Ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πικροτάτης ἀνεφύησαν βίξης Κλεοβαοί, Δοσιθεοί, Γορθηνοί," κ.τ.λ. Theodoret, Hær. Fab., lib. i. c. 1; Op., tom. iv. p. 193. B.

<sup>f</sup> "There is another question, whether the Gnostics are to be considered as constituting a distinct heresy, or whether many heretics, who held very different sentiments, were called by this common and generic name. They are treated as a separate sect by Epiphanius" (lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 26; Op., tom. i. p. 82), "Augustin" (De Hæres., c. vi.; Op., tom. viii. pp. 6. F, 7. A, B.), "Prædestinatus, and others: but the earlier Fathers evidently understood the name to apply to different bodies of men, who had certain opinions in common concerning God, the Demiurgus, the Æons, Jesus Christ, &c. . . I cannot but agree with Buddeus, in thinking that the earlier Fathers were right, and that Gnostic was a generic and not a specific term. Langius also asserts . . . that the name of Gnostic was general, and applied to all those who used γνῶσις, . . as a cloak to their theology." Burton, Bampton Lect., Note 34. pp. 360, 361: and see authorities there quoted.



§ 3. Among these, one was set up by Nicolas, one of the seven (Acts vi. 5). Or, at least, under his name. For though some, in Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>g</sup>, seem to hold him a holy man, yet no man doubts, that there was a sect of Gnostics, which (either because raised by him, or by others upon mistake of some things that he had taught) bore his name<sup>h</sup>. Which though it be not requisite here to decide, yet it is evident by St. John, Apoc. ii. 6, [15,] that then the sect was on foot. And though we dispute not the time, when Basilides<sup>i</sup> at Alexandria, Saturninus<sup>k</sup> at Antiochia, Valentine<sup>l</sup> at Rome, or in Cyprus and Egypt, Carpocrates<sup>m</sup>, Mark the magician<sup>n</sup>,

CHAP.  
XII.

That they were in being during the Apostles' time.

<sup>g</sup> "Τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ φάσκοντες ἑαυτοὺς Νικολάῳ ἐπεσθαί, ἀπομνημόνευμά τι τῶνδ' ἄνδρ' ἑρόντες ἐκ πατρώου, τὸ δὲ ἄν' παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκί. Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολοῦειν δέιν ἐδήλου τὰς τε ἡδονὰς τὰς τε ἐπιθυμίας· καὶ τῇ ἀσκήσει ταύτῃ καταμαραίνειν τὰς τῆς σαρκὸς ὁρμὰς τε καὶ ἐπιθέσεις." Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. ii. c. 20; Op., pp. 490, 491. And to the same effect, *ibid.*, lib. iii. c. 4; *ibid.*, p. 523.

<sup>h</sup> See Burton, Bampton Lect., Lect. v. pp. 145—155; and Note 66. pp. 458—462.

<sup>i</sup> Basilide "se revolta contre l'Eglise par ses mensonges quelque temps après les Apostres (c'est à dire ce semble sous Trajan), et parut principalement sous Adrien, aussi bien que Saturnin, mais un peu plus tard, puisque S. Irenée et les autres ensuite mettent toujours Saturnin le premier," &c. Tillemont, Mem. Eccles., tom. ii. p. 219. art. Basilide.—"Saint Jerome semble mettre Basilide entre les hérétiques qui ont paru des le vivant des Apostres; et on voit par S. Jean de Damas, que quelques uns ont cru qu'il avoit esté reconnu pour hérétique par S. Jean l'Evangéliste. S. Epiphane ne met aussi que peu de temps entre luy et Cerinthe qu'il pretend avoir paru des les premiers temps de l'Eglise. D'autre part Eusebe ne parle de luy que sous le regne d'Adrien, tant dans sa chronique sur l'an 133, que dans son histoire," and so also Theodoret, S. Clement of Alexandria, Firmilian, S. Irenæus, Hegesippus: but "il semble qu'on peut accorder une bonne partie de ces autorités différentes, en disant avec quelques personnes habiles de ce temps, que Saturnin et Basilide ont paru dès le temps de Trajan et on

continué sous Adrien. . . Ce que dit le Prædestinatus du Pere Sirmond, que Saturnin a esté condamné par S. Thomas Apostre, ne le fera pas croire plus ancien à tous ceux qui connoissent ce que c'est que cet auteur." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 584. note sur la vie de Basilide.— See below, § 6. note o.

<sup>k</sup> See the last note.

<sup>l</sup> See Tillemont, Mem. Eccl., tom. ii. pp. 257 sq., who dates his passing from Egypt to Rome in the pontificate of Hyginus (A.D. 139—142), his preaching in Cyprus after 143, and his death (after returning again to Rome) in the pontificate of Anicetus, and not later than 161.

<sup>m</sup> "Il est assez difficile de déterminer en quel temps Carpocrate a paru; puisque d'une part Tertullian et S. Epiphane le mettent avant Cerinthe, c'est à dire des la naissance de l'Eglise: et que de l'autre, le mesme S. Epiphane nous donne lieu de croire qu'il n'a paru que vers le temps d'Adrien, comme Eusebe le dit, suivi par Theodoret, . . mais par une citation de S. Irenée qui paroist fautive. Néanmoins . . il semble qu'il vaille mieux suivre ceux qui le mettent plustard." Tillemont, Mem. Eccles., tom. ii. p. 602. Note I. sur les Carpocratians.

<sup>n</sup> "Alius vero quidam ex iis qui sunt apud eos, magistri emendatorem se esse glorians, Marcus est autem illi nomen, magicæ artis peritissimus." *Iren.*, Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 8. p. 56. a.—"S. Irenée en refutant ses erreurs, vers l'an 180 ou 190, suppose qu'il vivoit encore. Ainsi l'on peut juger de la croyance que merite le Prædestinatus du P. Sirmond, qui nous fait une grande histoire de la condamnation de cet hérésiarque par le Pape S. Clement, du premier siècle.

BOOK II. or others, set up (so as to affirm that they were in being when the Apostles writ); yet it is evident, that under the Apostles there were such as counterfeited themselves Christians, with an intent to withdraw the simple sort of Christians to this doctrine, which these fathers of heretics in their several times were the heads of, whosoever then set them on work.

[Argument the first.]

§ 4. I will use but two arguments to evidence this. The first is, the common infection which they brought in every where, of eating things sacrificed to idols: that is to say, of worshipping idols; for, the feasts and entertainments of idolaters consisting of those things which had been sacrificed to their idols, to feast with them was to communicate in their idolatries. This cannot be more evident than it is evident by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 7; "Nor be ye idolaters as some of them were, as it is written, the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play;" the idolatry of the Israelites consisting in the feast, as well as in their sacrifices: and by Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16; "Lest thou make a league with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and sacrifice to their gods, and invite thee, and thou eat of their sacrifices; and thou take of their daughters to thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods." Which you see how punctually it came to pass in the business of Baal Peor, Num. xxv. Now it is manifest by the most ancient writers of the Church, Justin the Martyr<sup>o</sup>, Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>p</sup>, Irenæus<sup>q</sup>, Tertullian<sup>r</sup>, Origen<sup>s</sup>; that the Gnostics did generally communicate in the idolatries of the Gentiles: whose testimonies have been produced by Dr. H. Hammond in divers of his writings<sup>t</sup>. And the reason is plain, by that old observation, that the gods of the heathens are good fellows but the true God only a jealous God; that is to say, that false gods never grudged one another the

Marc estoit de la secte de Valentin." Tillemont, Mem. Eccles., tom. ii. p. 291. art. Marcosiens.

<sup>o</sup> Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud., c. lxxx. p. 177. ed. Bened. See above, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 27. note q.

<sup>p</sup> Strom., lib. iii. c. 4. pp. 522 sq. ed. Potter. See above, *ibid.*, note s.

<sup>q</sup> Adv. Hæres., lib. i. c. 23. p. 98. b.

ed. Grabe. See above, *ibid.*, note p.

<sup>r</sup> Scorpiac. adv. Gnostic., c. xv. p. 833. A—C. See above, *ibid.*, note t.

<sup>s</sup> Cont. Celsum, lib. vi. § 11; Op., tom. i. p. 638. ed. Bened. See above, *ibid.*, note r.

<sup>t</sup> Dissert. de Antichristo, c. iii. § 17; Works, vol. iv. p. 727.—Comment. on Revel. c. ii. v. 4. note b; *ibid.*, vol. iii. pp. 872—874.



worship of God, because all set up by the devil, to whose service that worship redounded. For the Gnostics being themselves idolaters and magicians<sup>u</sup>, it is no marvel, that they communicated as freely in the idolatries of the Gentiles, as they in one another's idolatries. But it is no less manifest, that those heresies which the Apostles writ against, agreed all in teaching to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to communicate with idolaters. For "the way of Balaam," in which they are by the Apostles charged to go astray (Jude 11, 2 Pet. ii. 15), is interpreted, Apoc. ii. [14,] 15, that there were in the Church of Pergamus "those that held the doctrine of Balaam, that taught Balak to lay a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat of things offered to idols, and to commit whoredom; so hast thou," saith he, "those that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans:" which, by and by, is attributed to "Jezebel the prophetess."

C H A P.  
XII.

[Rev. ii.  
20.]

[Argu-  
ment the  
second.]

§ 5. The second argument is, that both St. Peter and St. Jude, in the places alleged, do manifestly shew, that the doctrines which they writ against, tended to reconcile the licentiousness of the flesh with the hope of the world to come: which, I have shewed, was the pretence of the Gnostics; and makes it very probable, that the same heretics found access to those Christians to whom St. James writes<sup>x</sup>, and intimated to them hope of salvation through the bare profession of Christianity, without those works whereby it is fulfilled; which is the occasion that he takes (James ii. 14—[26]) to lay down those terms of the justification of sinners which I have declared in due place<sup>y</sup>. For consider the terms in which St. Peter writes:—"Many shall follow their corruptions, for whom the way of truth shall be blasphemed." For what can this signify, but that which is witnessed by so many of the fathers: that the ill opinion which the Gentiles had of Christianity, was unjustly occa-

<sup>u</sup> See Burton, Bampton Lect., Note 44. pp. 379—386: arguing against Beausobre and Lardner.

<sup>x</sup> "This Apostle" (St. James) "c. ii. v. 14. proceeds to a punctual discourse of the absolute necessity of superadding works of charity to faith, or else it will 'profit nothing,' directly opposite to the doctrine of Simon and his Gnosticks, of whom saith Irenæus,"

&c. Hammond, on St. James i. 27. So also Grotius (ad loc.), and Bp. Bull (Exam. Cens., Resp. de Animadv. xv. § 8, Works, vol. iv. p. 188). But, on the other hand, see the arguments of Buddeus, Ursinus, and others, cited by Burton (Bampton Lect., Note 48. pp. 405, 406), that St. James is *not* referring to the Gnostics.

<sup>y</sup> Above, c. ix. § 11—13.

BOOK  
II.

sioned by the villainies of the Gnostics<sup>2</sup>; who, though holding in secret a faith utterly destructive to Christianity, nevertheless counterfeited themselves Christians, to withdraw Christians to themselves. Again: "Those that go after the flesh through the pollution of concupiscence." And: "Thinking it pleasure to revel it by day; spots and stains; making good cheer in their deceits, when they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, not to be quieted from sinning." And: "They beguile with the lusts of the flesh . . . those who had truly escaped those that live in error, promising them liberty, but being slaves to corruption themselves; for by whom a man is subdued, his slave he becomes." 2 Pet. ii. 2, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19. And St. Jude; "These dreaming defile the flesh:" and, "The things which they know by nature as brute beasts, in them they corrupt themselves:" comparing them to "Sodom and Gomorrah," who "went a whoring in like manner as these, following after strange flesh." Jude 7, 8, 10. Which he who compares with the villainies of the Gnostics related by Irenæus<sup>a</sup>, Epiphanius<sup>b</sup>, and others<sup>c</sup>, either he hath lost his right senses, or (knowing by Irenæus<sup>d</sup>, that all the Gnostics sprang from Simon Magus, and that Simon Magus pretended to shew how to attain the world to come by loosing the reins to all villainy) must needs allow, that they are of this train whom these Apostles writ against.

[Testimony of  
Hegesippus.]

§ 6. Nor is the testimony of Hegesippus, related by Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, iii. 32<sup>e</sup>, to the contrary. He saith indeed,

<sup>a</sup> Euseb., H. E., lib. iv. c. 7; pp. 120. D, 121. A—C.—Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph., c. x.; Op., p. 111. A. ed. Bened.: and Apol. Ima, cc. x., xxiii., xxvi.; ibid., pp. 49. B, 58. A, 59. D, E.—Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 24; p. 100. a, b.—Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 27. § 3; Op., tom. i. p. 104. B, C.—See Burton's Bampton Lect., Lect. v. pp. 144, 151—153; and Note 63. pp. 447—450: who cites these and other Fathers.

<sup>a</sup> Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 1. § 11, 12; pp. 29—32: c. 8. p. 56: c. 9. § 2; pp. 60—62: c. 23. p. 98. b: c. 24. p. 100. b.—See Burton, ibid., Note 62. pp. 443—447.

<sup>b</sup> Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 26. § 3 sq.; Op., tom. i. pp. 84 sq.: Hær. 27. § 4; ibid., pp. 104. D, 105. A—D.

<sup>c</sup> Polycarp., Ad. Philipp., § 7; pp. 479, 480. ap. PP. Apost. ed. Jacobson.—Tertull., De Præscript., c. xliii.; Op., pp. 339. C, 340. D.—Theodoret., Hær. Fab., lib. v. c. 27; Op., tom. iv. pp. 311, 312.—Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. iii. c. 2. p. 513.—See Burton as quoted in note a, and the authorities there referred to.

<sup>d</sup> "Habent quoque et vocabulum a principe impiissimæ sententiæ Simone, dicti Simoniani; a quibus falsi nominis scientia accepit initia, sicut ex ipsis assertionibus eorum adest discere." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 20; p. 95. b. See also lib. i. c. 33; p. 106. a: lib. iv. c. 58; p. 358. b. And see above, § 2. notes y, e.

<sup>e</sup> "Ἐπὶ τοῖς" (the martyrdom of Simeon) "ὁ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος" (Hegesippus) "διηγούμενος τὰ κατὰ τοὺς δηλοῦ-



that the Church had continued a pure virgin under the Apostles and their hearers; he saith, that it began to be deflowered in the next age; not by the coming in of Antichrist, as some imagine<sup>f</sup> (unless they will have Simon Magus to have been Antichrist, which, though true<sup>g</sup>, is not for their turn), but by the coming in of the Gnostics. For though it appear by the writings of the Apostles, that they were very busy during their time in seducing Christians by counterfeiting themselves the like: yet may it well stand good, that the Church continued a virgin by casting them out, according to the precept of St. Jude, which I spoke of afore<sup>h</sup>; but that after the death of them and their hearers they prevailed so far, that they might be said to have deflowered the maidenhead of Christianity, for the number of Christians whom they had seduced. Besides, it is easy to take notice, that the relation of Hegesippus concerns particularly the Church of Jerusalem, as following upon the martyrdom of Simeon, and the confession of our Lord Christ to Domitian made by His kindred according to the flesh. For so Eusebius expressly affirmeth<sup>i</sup>. And, truly, having related afore the heresies of Simon Magus<sup>j</sup>, and Menander<sup>k</sup>, of Ebion<sup>l</sup>, of the Nazarites<sup>m</sup>, and of Cerinthus<sup>n</sup>, he must have given himself the lie, had he intended to say out of Hegesippus, that the Gnostics began under Adrian; though being the time, when Saturninus, Basilides, Valentine, and probably others, set up for themselves<sup>o</sup>. But

μένους, ἐπιλέγει ὡς ἄρα μέχρι τῶν τότε χρόνων παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἐν ἀδήλῳ που σκότει φωλευόντων εἰσέτι τότε τῶν (εἰ καὶ τινες ὑπῆρχον) παραφθείρειν ἐπιχειρούντων τὸν ὑγιῆ κανόνα τοῦ σωτηρίου κηρύγματος. ὡς δὲ ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς διάφορον εἰλήφει τοῦ βίου τέλος, παρεληλύθει τε ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη τῶν αὐταῖς ἀκοαῖς τῆς ἐνθέου σοφίας ἐπακοῦσαι κατηξιωμένων, τῆς αὐτῆς τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύστασις διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης." Euseb., H. E., lib. iii. c. 32; pp. 104. D, 105. A.

<sup>f</sup> Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. xl. p. 159: commenting upon Eusebius, H. E., iii. 32.

<sup>g</sup> See Burton, Bampton Lect., Note 48. pp. 396—404.

<sup>h</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ix. § 21, 22.

<sup>i</sup> H. E., lib. iii. c. 32. p. 104. B.—

"Videtur Eusebius toti Ecclesiæ tribuisse id quod de unica Hierosolymorum Ecclesia dictum fuerat ab Hegesippo." Vales., ad Euseb., H. E., iii. 32.

<sup>j</sup> Euseb., H. E., lib. ii. c. 13; lib. iii. c. 26; pp. 50, 51, 98.

<sup>k</sup> Id., *ibid.*, lib. iii. c. 26; p. 98.

<sup>l</sup> Id., *ibid.*, c. 27; p. 99.

<sup>m</sup> This looks like a mistake for "Nicolaitans," of whom Eusebius treats in lib. iii. c. 29 (p. 101): while he does not mention the Nazarites or Nazarenes; who are first spoken of as heretics by Epiphanius.

<sup>n</sup> Id., *ibid.*, lib. iii. c. 28; p. 100.

<sup>o</sup> "The fact seems to be, that Clement" (of Alex.) "spoke of Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, because they were much more notorious Gnosticism to regular systems."

He by no

BOOK II. I will wish the enemies of this light, which the knowledge of good learning (that will surely be revenged of them who neglect it) tenders to the obscure passages of the Apostles, no worse punishment, than to be bound to expound them without it. For make use of it, and all is plain and smooth before you: unless it be a small circumstance, that "they tremble not to blaspheme glories," 2 Pet. ii. 10; or as St. Jude 8, that "they despise dominion and blaspheme glories:" whereas, if you put it out, you will necessarily reason of the Apostles' discourse as blind men do of colours. And in truth there are two several passages of Hegesippus related by Eusebius; the former whereof I have quoted, assigning this deflowering of the Church to the time of Simeon's mar-<sup>83</sup>tyrdom. But the other, though related by Eusebius (iv. 22<sup>a</sup>) at the time of Hegesippus, assigns it unto this beginning, immediately ensuing upon the martyrdom of St. James, and the choice of Simeon for bishop of Jerusalem: and that by a very express mark of the author thereof, one Thebulis (so R. Stephens's copy reads it, not Thebuthis\*), that missed the bishopric there, and upon that attempted to deflower the Church; which "they called then a virgin," saith Hegesippus expressly there<sup>8</sup>. Now it is manifest, that the martyrdom of James was before the war with the Romans, the same year that Festus left the province<sup>t</sup>, as you have it in Eusebius, ii. 23<sup>n</sup>: at which time it may be a question, whether either the

would infer, that heresy began in the time of Hadrian." . . And so from Euseb. iii. 32, and iv. 22, "we come to the same conclusion, that it was not till the time of Trajan or Hadrian, that Christians openly came forward as leaders of heresies." Burton, Lectures, Note 6. pp. 261, 262. See above, § 3. notes i—n: and Mede, Works, Bk. V. c. vii. pp. 1101—1103, who comes to a similar conclusion.

<sup>p</sup> "Whether these" (δόξαι) "be men or angels, is not so clear. That they are angels, is made probable by these arguments; viz.," &c. Yet "we find not in any Church writers, that the heresie of the Gnosticks had anything in it of particular opposition or defiance to angels, but on the contrary the Cæones, noting the angels, make up a great part of their divinity." Hammond, on St. Jude v. 8.

<sup>q</sup> Μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρησαί Ἰάκωβον

τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου Αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, δεύτερον. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκαλοῦν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρθένον· οὕτω γὰρ ἐφθάρτο ἀκούσις ματαίοις. Ἀρχεται δὲ ὁ Θέβουθις, διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπον, ὑποφθέρειν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπὶ αἵρέσεων, ὧν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ἀφ' ὧν Σίμων, ὅθεν οἱ Σιμωνιανοί· καὶ Κλεόβιος," κ.τ.λ. Euseb., H. E., lib. iv. c. 22; p. 142. C, D: quoting from Hegesippus.

<sup>r</sup> "In codice Reg. Maz. et Fuk. necnon apud Nicephorum legitur θέβουθις. Rufinus Theobutem vertit." Vales. in loc., who reads Θέβουθις. The edition of R. Stephens (Paris. 1544 fol.) has θέβουλις (folio 41. a. line 30).

<sup>s</sup> See above, note q.

<sup>t</sup> Viz., A.D. 62.

<sup>u</sup> "Διὰ τὸ τεθνᾶναι μὲν φῆστον, Ἄλ-



second Epistle of St. Peter, or that of St. Jude, were written at all or not<sup>x</sup>. Wherefore it is manifest, that Hegesippus assigneth the deflowering of the Church to the time of Simeon's martyrdom, when none of the Apostles remained alive; but so that Thebulis began to deflower it from the death of St. James, and the beginning of Simeon: that is, the Church of Jerusalem, because he was refused the bishopric of it.

CHAP.  
XII.

§ 7. But I must not forget Epiphanius<sup>y</sup> his relation of Cerinthus; that he was one of those that first contended with St. Peter about admitting Cornelius and his company to baptism, that afterward raised the contention about circumcision in the Church of Antiochia (which we see decided by the Apostles, Acts xv.), and that afterwards it was he, or his disciples, that troubled the Church of Corinth, and the doctrine which St. Paul had taught it. For the argument is undeniable, that the things done under the Apostles have in them express marks of that, which the succeeding heretics did and taught afterwards. “*Ἀποστάντων γὰρ τούτων,*” saith he, “*καὶ εἰς ψευδαποστόλους τραπέντων, καὶ ἄλλους ψευδαποστόλους ἀποστειλάντων, ὥς καὶ ἤδη προεῖρηται, εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐν ἀρχῇ, καὶ εἰς ἄλλους τόπους, λέγοντας, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περιτμηθῇτε, καὶ φυλάξῃτε τὸν νόμον Μωϋσεως,* [Acts xv. 1.] *οὐ δύνασθε σωθῆναι· οὐχ ἡ τυχοῦσα ταραχὴ ἐγένετο, ὥς προεῖρηται· καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ εἰρημένοι* [2 Cor. xi. 13.] *ψευδαπόστολοι, ἐργάται δόλιοι, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ*”—“For those men, stepping aside, and becoming false Apostles, and sending other false Apostles, as

βίον δὲ ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν.” Euseb., H. E., lib. ii. c. 23; p. 66. A.

<sup>x</sup> St. Peter's second Epistle is usually dated A.D. 65; St. Jude's certainly in a later year, although authorities vary as to how many years later.

<sup>y</sup> “Οὗτος δὲ ἐστίν, ἀγαπητοί, εἰς τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁ τὴν ταραχὴν ἐργασάμενος, ὅτε οἱ περὶ Ἰάκωβον γεγραψαὶν εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐπιστολὴν, λέγοντες· ὅτι ἔγνωμέν τινας ἐξ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθόντας, καὶ τὰρξάντας ὑμᾶς λόγοις, οἳ οὐ διετελεύταμεθα. Καὶ οὗτος εἰς ἐστὶ τῶν ἀντιστάντων τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ, ἐπειδὴ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς Κορινθίον τὸν ἅγιον, ὅτε μετεστ—  
ξινωθεὶς ὁπτασίας

“Οὗτος οὖν παρεκίνει περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου ἀνελθόντος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὰ πλήθη τῶν ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγων,” κ. τ. λ. Epiph., Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 28. § 2; Op., tom. i. p. 111. B, C. For Cerinthians at Corinth, Id., *ibid.*, § 6; *ibid.*, p. 113. D. These statements appear to rest entirely upon the authority of Epiphanius. “Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Ussher, and Cave, were inclined to believe some of” them: but “they are opposed by Buddeus (Eccles. Apost., p. 127), Basnage (Annal. Polit. Eccles. ad an. 50. § 19. p. 599).” Burton, Bampton Lect., Lect. vi. p. 175. note f.

BOOK  
II.

I said afore, in the beginning to Antiochia, and other places, saying, that unless ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved; there came no small trouble, as I said afore; and these are they, that in Paul are called false Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ<sup>z</sup>. For here Epiphanius, distinguishing two kinds of false Apostles, one that pretended to be sent by our Lord Christ, another by His Apostles, applies unto them the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 13; by virtue of that of the synodical letter of the Apostles, Acts xv. 24, "To whom we gave no such charge:" and says, that whatsoever they pretended, they were neither sent by our Lord Christ, nor yet by His Apostles' commission from Christ.

And that  
they were  
Gnostics.

§ 8. Herewith agrees all that, which the Apostle writes against eating things sacrificed to idols in the eighth and tenth chapters of this first Epistle. For there is no question to be made, that the sect of Cerinthus was one of the Gnostics<sup>a</sup>; because it is expressed in Epiphanius, that they also taught "the unknown God," whom they pretended to make known<sup>b</sup>. And, therefore, when St. Paul saith in the beginning of that eighth chapter, "As concerning things offered to idols, we know that we all have knowledge; knowledge indeed puffeth up, but charity edifieth;" it is manifest, that he civilly reproveth that pretence of knowledge which some weak Christians were then in danger to be carried away with; to believe, that those who knew the true God (whom their masters pretended to teach), and the idols of the Gentiles to be nothing, might without scruple of conscience communicate in the worship of those whom they scorned and thought to be nothing: intending in the tenth chapter to protest, that they could not communicate in the same without renouncing their Christianity. And if any man say, that Cerinthus (according to Epiphanius<sup>c</sup>) saith, that our Lord

[1 Cor.  
viii. 1.]

<sup>z</sup> Epiph., *ibid.*, § 4; *ibid.*, p. 113. A, B.

<sup>a</sup> See authorities in Burton, *Bampt. Lect.*, Note 74. pp. 476—478.

<sup>b</sup> "Σχεδὸν δὲ οὐδὲν ἕτερον παρὰ τὸν προειρημένον Καρποκράν ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ κόσμῳ κακοποιὰ φάρμακα ἐκβλυστάνει" (Cerinthus): and as a part of the general Gnostic scheme thus indicated, "Κατεληλυθέναι τὸν Χριστὸν

εἰς Αὐτὸν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν), τουτέστι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐν εἵδει περιστερᾷ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ ἀποκαλύψαι Αὐτῷ καὶ δι' Αὐτοῦ τοῖς μετ' Αὐτοῦ τὸν ἔγνωστον Πατέρα." Epiph., *Adv. Hær.*, lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 28. § 1; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 110. C, D.

<sup>c</sup> "Οὗτος ὁ Κήρυθος ἀνόητος καὶ ἀνόητων διδάσκαλος φάσκει πάλιν τολμήσας, Χριστὸν πεπονθέναι καὶ ἐσταυ-



Christ is not to rise again till the last day, and therefore that the opinion of those that deny the resurrection (which St. Paul disputes against, 1 Cor. xv.), can neither be imputed to

CHAP.  
XII.

84 Cerinthus nor the Cerinthians: it is answered, that Epiphanius<sup>d</sup> himself declares, that the Cerinthians were not all of a mind; some of them denying the resurrection of Christ, and by consequence of Christians, against whom the main of that chapter argues; others affirming, that Christ was not to rise again till all should rise again at the world's end. And truly I see not, why St. Paul should argue, that it is necessary that we should believe the resurrection of Christ; saying, "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and we are found false witnesses, then is your faith vain," and "ye are yet in your sins," 1 Cor. xv. 14—17; unless, among those whom he argues against, the resurrection of Christ had been questioned: which is Epiphanius his argument<sup>e</sup>.

§ 9. And I would fain hear, who can give a better account of that everlasting difficulty in St. Paul's words, that follow, 1 Cor. xv. 29,—“For what shall those that are baptized for the dead do, if the dead rise not again? why are they baptized for the dead?”—than Epiphanius gives according to this supposition, and that upon the credit of historical truth, not of any conjecture of his own:—“*Ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ τῇ πατρίδι, φημὶ δὲ Ἀσία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Γαλατίᾳ, πᾶν ἤκμασε τὸ τοῦτων διδασκαλεῖον ἐν οἷς καὶ τι παραδόσεως πρᾶγμα ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡς τινῶν μὲν παρ' αὐτοῖς προφθανόντων τελευτῆσαι ἄνευ βαπτίσματος, ἄλλους δὲ ἀντ' αὐτῶν εἰς ὄνομα ἐκείνων βαπτίζεσθαι, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἐν ἀναστάσει ἀναστάντας [αὐτοὺς] δοῦναι δίκην τιμωρίας, βάπτισμα μὴ εἰληφότας, γίνεσθαι δὲ ὑποχειρίους τῆς τοῦ Κοσμοποιοῦ ἐξουσίας*”—“For in this country, I mean Asia and Galatia, this sect flourished much; among whom a point of tradition is come to us, how, some of

[Baptism  
for the  
dead.]

ρῶσθαι μήπω δὲ ἐγγεράθαι· μέλλειν δὲ ἀνίστασθαι, ὅταν ἡ καθόλου γένηται τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις.” Id., *ibid.*, § 6; *ibid.*, p. 113. D.

<sup>d</sup> “*Τούτων δὲ*” (Cerinthiorum) “οἱ μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν μηδέπω ἐγγεράθαι κεκήρύχασιν, ἀνίστασθαι δὲ μετὰ πάντων· οἱ δὲ, ὅτι ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἀναστήσονται.” Id., *ibid.*, p. 114. C.

<sup>e</sup> “*Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, ἐκκληττόμενος τοῖς μὲν ἀπιστοῦσι τῇ ἀναστάσει*

*τῶν νεκρῶν τῇ μελλούσῃ ἔσεσθαι, λέγει· Εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται,*” κ.τ.λ. “*πάλιν δὲ τοῖς λέγουσι τὸν Χριστὸν μηδέπω ἐγγεγερμένον, ὡσαύτως τὸν ἐλεγχον ἐπιφέρει, λέγων· Εἰ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγγεγερται,*” κ.τ.λ. “*ὡς τῶν μὲν Ἀποστόλων κηρυττόντων Χριστὸν ἐγγεράθαι, τινῶν δὲ αἰρέσεων λεγουσῶν Χριστὸν μὲν ἐγγεράθαι, νεκροὺς δὲ μὴ ἐγείρεσθαι.*” Id., *ibid.*, pp. 113. D, 114. A.

BOOK  
II.

them dying before baptism, others are baptized for them in their name; that, rising at the resurrection, they may be liable to no sentence of punishment, as not having received baptism, and become obnoxious to the power of Him that made the world<sup>f</sup>." Where, by the way, you see the Cerinthians were Gnostics; because, by baptism, they pretended to free men from the bad principle which made the world: this being the doctrine of the Gnostics. Now if it be true, as Epiphanius understood, that the Cerinthians in Asia and Galatia baptized others for those that were dead without baptism, shall we think it strange, that those false Apostles, who transformed themselves into Apostles of Christ, as Satan into an angel of light, should teach the Corinthians to do the same? And what need St. Paul stand to condemn this, condemning all their impostures by the dispute of both Epistles?

[2 Cor. xi.  
13, 14.]["Doc-  
trines of  
devils."]

§ 10. Neither is it more difficult to discern those, whom St. Paul disputes against in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Colossians, to be of the same stamp; if we observe two points of his reproof: the one, the worship of angels, the other, abstinence from certain meats and from women; which St. Paul couches in these words, Coloss. ii. 21, "Touch not, taste not, come not nigh those things, which all tend to perish in the using." This you may perceive by the warning he gives Timothy of the like men; who afterwards should "depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of devils, . . who should forbid marriage, and enjoin abstinence from meats, which God hath made to be received of those that know Him with thanksgiving:" 1 Tim. iv. 1—3.

Mr. Meder. I know there is a plausible opinion abroad, that these "doctrines of devils," as I translate it, are the traditions which have crept into the Church for the worshipping of the souls of holy men departed; which some Christians have brought into the rank of those secondary gods which the Gentiles call *dæmones* or *demonia*<sup>h</sup>. But this opinion cannot be true.

<sup>f</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 114. A, B. That *ὁ Κοσμοποιὸς* means with the Cerinthians the Evil Principle, see Epiphani., *ibid.*, Hær. 27. § 2; and Hær. 28. § 1: *ibid.*, pp. 102. D, 110. C.

<sup>g</sup> Added in margin in MS.

<sup>h</sup> "Now therefore judge impartially whether S. Paul's Prophecy be not ful-

filled already amongst Christians, who foretold that the time should come that they should Apostatize and revive again *Διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων*, *Doctrines of Dæmons*; whether the deifying and worshipping of Saints and Angels, whether the bowing down to Images, whether of *μῆ* or other things visible, broaden Idols, &c



First, because it is plain, that the second (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων) serves to interpret the first (πνεύμασι πλάνοις). Now it is manifest, that by "seducing spirits" St. Paul can mean nothing but those inspirations (true or pretended) which the devil and his ministers corrupted Christianity with. And, therefore, when he declares himself further, by adding "and doctrines of devils," he means doctrines taught by devils<sup>i</sup>. Secondly, because the word *dæmones* or *dæmonia* is never used in a good sense among Christians; as it is among pagans<sup>k</sup>. For those that knew not the difference between

CHAP.  
XII.

*Crosses like new Dæmon-Pillars, whether the adoring or templing of Reliques, whether these make not as lively an image of the Gentiles' Theology of Dæmons [διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων] as possibly could be expressed.*" Mede, Apostasy of the Latter Times; or, The Gentiles' Theology of Dæmons Revived in the Latter Times amongst Christians, in Worshipping of Angels, Deifying and Invoking of Saints, Adoring of Reliques, Bowing down to Images and Crosses, &c. (first published in Lond. 1641): c. vi. p. 781. Works, Lond., 1664.

—"διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων, Doctrines of Dæmons: not which Dæmons or Devils are authors of (though that be true), as if the Genitive case were active: but Doctrines concerning Dæmons, the Genitive case δαιμονίων being here to be taken passively for the object of those doctrines; as in Heb. vi. 2. we have διδασχαι βαπτισμῶν doctrines of Baptisms, and doctrines of laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgement, that is, doctrines about and concerning all these." Id., ibid., c. ii. p. 771.—"Some take it" (the word Spirit) "in this place for Doctors of Spirituall things, and so πνεύματα πλάνα, or as some read, πλάνης, should be Doctors of errors. But I had rather take Spirits in this place for Doctrines themselves." Id., ibid., p. 770.—"But perhaps I am yet too forward in my Application; some things in our way must first be cleared: For howsoever the resemblance indeed be evident, yet, First, the Text seems not to intend or mean it, because the word δαιμόνιον is in the Scripture never taken in the better or indifferent sense, howsoever prophane Authors do so use it, but alwaies in an evil sense, for the Devil

μόνιον in Scripture, I say, that because those which the Gentiles took for Dæmons and for Deificated Souls of their Worthies were indeed no other than Evil Spirits, . . . therefore the Scripture useth the name Dæmons for that they were indeed, and not for what they seemed to be. . . . Secondly, though the Scripture often useth this word in the worst sense, yet follows it not it alwaies should doe so" (which he proceeds to establish, instancing especially Acts xvii. 18). Id., ibid., c. vi. p. 782.

<sup>i</sup> "Solent autem sic" (scil. πνεύματα πλάνα) "appellari ab Apostolis ii qui Prophetiam se a Deo habere dicunt, cum tamen vere de suo aut de Satanæ dictatis loquantur. Vide 1 Joh. iv. 1. et seq." Grot. in loc.—"Spiritus impostores Chrysostomus interpretatur ipsos homines, nimirum falsos doctores et prophetas. . . Alii spiritus erroris dæmones intelligunt. Hos enim Scriptura spiritus mendaces appellat 3 Reg. ult. et alibi. Favet etiam quod hic additur, et doctrinis dæmoniorum. Sed, hoc non obstante, prior sententia magis placet. Attendant enim homines spiritibus erroris et doctrinis dæmoniorum; dum aures præbent magistris ea docentibus quæ dæmonibus suggerentibus didicerunt." Estius in loc.

<sup>k</sup> "In Scriptura Sacra δαίμων nunquam in laude sed semper in vituperio ponitur, ut observat Augustinus lib. ix. De Civ. Dei, c. 19, et Origenes lib. v. cont. Celsum p. 234." Suicer, in voc. δαίμων § 5.—The word δαιμόνια is once used in the N. T. in an indifferent sense: but it is in reporting the belief of the pagan Athenians, that St. Paul was "ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελέως" (Acts xvii. 18). And it is occasionally used of the objects of pagan worship, as in 1 Cor. x. 19, 20, 21. See Schleusner in voc.

To the First  
he word δαι-

BOOK II. good spirits and bad, but in effect (as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21) "worshipped devils," it is not to be expected, that they should express a meaning to scorn or detest those whom they worshipped. And whatsoever opinions those philosophers which followed Plato and Pythagoras had of the vulgar idolatries of their countries, seeing there is so much appearance, as I have shewed in another place<sup>1</sup>, that they were magicians, it is no marvel that they make not the difference between good and evil spirits, which Christianity alone fully declareth; the Jews themselves not having sufficiently discovered it in and by the Scriptures of the Old Testament<sup>m</sup>. But as the word *εἰδωλον*, "an idol," signifying of itself indifferently any image or representation, to Christians and Jews, who understand the Gentiles to worship false gods, signifies the image of those gods in an ill sense; so, to those that understand the devils to put themselves upon the world to be worshipped for gods, the "doctrines of devils" must needs be those which men guided by devils do advance.

The beginning of the Encratites under the Apostles.

§ 11. I must here suppose further, that which I read in Epiphanius<sup>n</sup>, that Marcion and Tatianus, with his scholars the Encratites (who enjoined their disciples to abstain from women, and certain kinds of meats, as not of God's making), had their beginning from Saturninus, he from Simon Magus; as Irenæus, i. 30<sup>o</sup>, affirmeth. Whereby it cannot seem strange, that their doctrine should be in vogue during the time of the Apostles. I demand then, what reason can be given, why they who taught the worshipping of angels, should also enjoin abstinence from women and meats; were there not in the case an opinion, that marriage and those creatures come not from God, but, by some failure of His, as Simon Magus said from the beginning, from the angels? To which purpose we must observe, that St. Paul gives them warning of "philosophy," Coloss. ii. 8: because it is certain, that these sects took their rise from the writings of Plato and Pytha-

<sup>1</sup> Review of Right of the Church, &c., c. v. § 41.

<sup>m</sup> But Lightfoot on the contrary (Works, vol. ii. p. 441)—"The Jews distinguish between Spirits, and Devils, and Good Angels: שְׂרֵת יְשִׁירִים רִחוּת; מְלָאכִי."

<sup>n</sup> Epiphanius, Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. iii. Hær. 42; Op., tom. i. pp. 302. A. sq.: Hær. 46; *ibid.*, pp. 390. D. sq.: lib. II. tom. i. Hær. 47; *ibid.*, pp. 399. A. sq.

<sup>o</sup> See below, § 12. notes 1



goras, and their followers; whom Tertullian therefore styleth CHAP.  
XII.  
“the patriarchs of heretics”.

§ 12. But the words of Irenæus deserve here to be considered. Having promised to refute Marcion in due place<sup>a</sup>:—*“Nunc autem necessario meminimus ejus, ut scires quoniam omnes qui quoquo modo adulterant veritatem, et præconium Ecclesiæ lædunt, Simonis Samaritani magi discipuli et successores sunt: quamvis non confiteantur nomen magistri sui, ad seductionem reliquorum; attamen illius sententiam docent; Christi quidem Jesu nomen tanquam irritamentum præferentes, Simonis autem impietatem varie introducentes”*—“But it was necessary that we should remember him now, that thou mightest know, that all those who any way adulterate the truth, and wrong that which the Church preacheth, are the scholars and successors of Simon the magician of Samaria: though to deceive others they profess not their master’s name, yet they teach his sense; pretending indeed for a stale the name of Christ Jesus, but divers ways introducing Simon’s impious doctrines”.

And by and by: *“Ut exempli gratia dicamus, a Saturnino et Marcione, qui vocantur Continentes, abstinentiam a nuptiis annunciaverunt, frustrantes antiquam plasmationem Dei, et oblique accusantes Eum Qui et masculum et fæminam ad generationem hominum fecit, et eorum quæ dicuntur apud eos animalium abstinentiam induxerunt, ingrati existentes Ei qui omnia fecit Deo”*—“To speak for example, from Saturninus and Marcion, those that are called Encratites, preach abstinence from marriage, frustrating that which God framed of old, and indirectly blaming Him That made male and female for the procreation of mankind, and introduce abstinence from those which they call living creatures, being ungrateful to God That made all things”.

<sup>a</sup> “Hæreticorum patriarchæ philosophi.” Tertull., Adv. Hermogenem, c. viii.; Op., p. 413. B.—“Doleo bona fide, Platonem omnium hæreticorum condimentarium factum.” Id., De Anima, c. xxiii.; Op., p. 488. D.—“Viderint, qui Stoicum et Platonicum et Dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt.” Id., De Præscript., c. vii.; ibid., p. 331. C.

<sup>q</sup> “Sed huic quidem” (Marcioni), “scorum contradicemus,” &c. Iren., Hæc., lib. i. c. 29; p. 105.

<sup>\*</sup> Id., ibid., c. 30; ibid.

<sup>\*</sup> Id., ibid. The original Greek is here preserved by Euseb., H. E., lib. iv. c. 29. p. 150. “Ἀπὸ Σατορνίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος οἱ καλούμενοι Ἐγκρατεῖς ἀγαμίαν ἐκήρυξαν, ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἀρχαίαν πλάσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡρέμα κατηγοροῦντες τοῦ ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ εἰς γένεσιν ἀνθρώπων πεποιηκότος καὶ τῶν λεγομένων παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐμψύχων ἀποχὴν εἰσηγάσαντο, ἀχαριστοῦντες τῷ πάντα πεποιηκότι Θεῷ.”

BOOK  
II.

§ 13. If Marcion and Saturninus had this doctrine from Simon Magus, of necessity it must have been on foot during the time of the Apostles. Only, here will lie a difficult objection from that which I shewed a little afore<sup>t</sup>, that Simon Magus baited his doctrine with the pleasures of sensual concupiscence, as the means to gain followers; if, instead of the hardship of Christ's cross, he could persuade them, that believing the secret knowledge which he taught, the free use of them was the means to attain the world to come: And of Cerinthus in particular, he that shall peruse what Eusebius hath related out of Caius and Dionysius of Alexandria, *Eccl'es. Hist.* iii. 28<sup>u</sup>, shall easily perceive the whole aim of his sect to have been the enjoying of sensual pleasure. So that<sup>86</sup> the saying of those whom St. Paul writes against, 1 Cor. xv. 32, "Let us eat and drink for to morrow we shall die," exactly fits his followers. And so doth the pretence of those, who seduced the Galatians to observe the Law, though themselves kept not the Law, that they might not be persecuted with the cross of Christ; Gal. vi. 12, 13: that is, that would have them comply with the Jews in keeping the Law, so far as might save them from being persecuted by the Jews; as well as with the Gentiles in their idolatries, to save them from persecution at their hand: according to the common principle of the Gnostics, that it was a folly to suffer for professing the faith<sup>r</sup>.

§ 14. To this it is easy to answer: that the devil might have several baits for several qualities of persons, even in the same common principles of Simon Magus; whereof if we see some sects embrace some, others those that seem inconsistent with them, being certified that both spring from the same source, it is no ways incredible, that the seeds of all of them were sown in his common doctrine. That Carpocrates, that Prodicus, and the Gnostics that followed Nicolas, according

<sup>t</sup> Above, § 2, 5.

<sup>u</sup> "Τερατολογίας . . ἐπεισάγει" (Cerinthus), "λέγων, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν." Euseb., H. E., lib. iii. c. 28. p. 100: from Gains. — "Τοῦτο εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ" (Cerinthi) τὸ δόγμα, ἐπίγειον ἔσσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ

Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν· καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικὸς, ἐν τοῖτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσσεσθαι, γαστρός καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμονῶν· τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ ποτοῖς καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημώτερον ταῦτα φήθη πορεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσῖαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς. Ταῦτα Διονύσιος." Id., ibid.

<sup>x</sup> See Hammond, as quoted at § 4. note t.



to Epiphanius<sup>v</sup>, should be remarkable for unnatural uncleanness, having the way plained for them by Simon; how can it be strange? That refined spirits should be taken with such gross pretences as brutish people are apt to be seduced with, would be strange on the other side. And that magic, which Simon and Menander, with the Basilidians and Carpocratians, frequently practised (whatsoever the rest did), had always pretences of austerity in discipline, not only as a means to obtain influence from powers above, but to seduce the simple with a colour of severity and abstinence. Seeing then that Saturninus, upon Irenæus his credit, derived this discipline from the doctrine of Simon Magus, how can it seem improbable, that during St. Paul's time some branch of the same doctrine should spread over the parts of Asia concerned in St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy and to the Colossians? Whether by Cerinthus or by whom besides him, I need not dispute. There is no doubt indeed but (according to Epiphanius<sup>v</sup>) his heresy had vogue in these parts; as in Galatia, besides Epiphanius, Sirmondus his *Prædestinatus*<sup>a</sup> saith, that it is condemned there by St. Paul's Epistle. And Gaius, in Eusebius iii. 28<sup>b</sup>, testifieth, that Cerinthus pretended revelations by angels; and Tertullian, *Contra Marc.* v. 19<sup>c</sup>, that those who seduced the Colossians did the like. But whether Cerinthus, or some other branch of Simon Magus, the source of his doctrine is plainly from the same principle with Marcion and the Encratites afterwards.

§ 15. Now if any man demand, what all this may conduce to the understanding of those Scriptures which speak of our Lord Christ, let it be but considered, that Simon Magus, pretending to be the Christ, and to seduce Christians from our Lord Jesus to himself, and withal to be worshipped with

It is evident, that One God in Trinity was then glorified among the Christians, by the fullness of the Godhead which they

<sup>v</sup> Epiphanius, Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 27. § 4; Op., tom. i. pp. 104. A, 105. C: Hær. 25. § 7; *ibid.*, p. 81. C, D.

<sup>a</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, Hær. 28. § 6; Op., tom. i. p. 114. A, B. See above, § 9. note f.

<sup>b</sup> "Hos (Cerinthianos) in Galatia æterno anathemati beatus Apostolus Paulus condemnavit." Sirmondus, *Prædestinatus sive Prædestinatorum Hæresis*, lib. i. § 8: Op., tom. i. p. 114. D. Paris. 1696.

<sup>c</sup> οὐ φωνᾶς ἤδη πρότερον πα-

ρατέθειμαι, ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ αὐτοῦ ζητή-  
σει ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφει· Ἀλλὰ  
καὶ Κήρυθος, ὃ δὲ ἀποκαλύψων ὡς ὑπὲρ  
ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τε-  
ρατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ  
δειδεγμένους ψευδόμενος, ἐπεισάγει λέ-  
γων," κ.τ.λ. Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib.  
iii. c. 28; pp. 99. D, 100. A.

<sup>c</sup> "Si autem et aliquos taxat, qui ex  
visionibus angelicis dicebant cibis ab-  
stinendum," &c. Tertull., Cont. Marc.,  
lib. v. c. 19; Op., p. 802. D.

BOOK  
II.introduced  
instead  
of it.[Simon  
Magus.]

honours due to God, doth hereby effectually suppose, that our Lord was effectually so worshipped by Christians from the beginning.

§ 16. Irenæus saith further of the doctrine of Simon Magus, i. 20: that “he was glorified of many as God; and taught, that he was the man, who had appeared among the Jews as the Son” (that is, the Messias), “had come in Samaria as the Father, but to the rest of the Gentiles as the Holy Ghost: so that, being indeed the sovereign power of all, that is, the Father, he was content nevertheless to be whatsoever they called Him.”—“*Hic igitur a multis quasi Deus glorificatus est,*” saith Irenæus, “*et docuit semetipsum esse, qui inter Judæos quidem quasi Filius apparuerit, in Samaria autem quasi Pater descenderit, in reliquis vero gentibus quasi Spiritus Sanctus adventaverit: esse autem se sublimissimam virtutem, hoc est, Eum Qui sit super omnia Pater, et sustinere vocari se quodcunque Eum vocant homines<sup>d</sup>.*” Where, pretending first to be both Father and Son and Holy Ghost, secondly to be worshipped for God, it is manifest, that setting up himself instead of our Lord Jesus for the Messias, whom the Samaritans expected as well as the Jews, he had no other reason to pretend to be also the Father and the Holy Ghost, but because he knew our Lord, Whom he counterfeited, had taught that He is one and the same with the Father and the Holy Ghost. And so, by what the counterfeit<sup>87</sup> would be, it appeareth what the Truth is, and taught Himself to be; to wit, the Son of God, to be worshipped as one God with the Father and the Holy Ghost. For we are not to think, that Epiphanius contradicts his master Irenæus, when he says that Simon, who pretended to be the Father among the Samaritans (as the Son among the Jews), made his concubine Selena to be the Holy Ghost, whom he called also the “ennœa” or “conceit” of him (the Father), whereby he made the angels that made the world and mankind<sup>e</sup>: but

<sup>d</sup> Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 20; p. 94. b. See Burton's Bampton Lect., Lect. iv. p. 107; and Note 46. pp. 388—390.

<sup>e</sup> “Ἐαυτὸν εἶναι δυνάμιν Θεοῦ λέγων τὴν μεγάλην, τὴν δὲ σύζυγον πορνάδα Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον εἶναι τετόλμηκε λέγειν, καὶ διὰ ταύτην κατεληλυθέναι φησίν.

Ἐν ἐκάστῳ δὲ οὐρανῷ μετεμορφούμεν, φησί, κατὰ τὴν μορφήν τὴν ἐν ἐκάστῳ οὐρανῷ, ἵνα λάθω τὰς Ἀγγελικὰς μὲν δυνάμεις καὶ κατέλθω ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑννοίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν αὕτη ἡ καὶ Προόνικος καὶ Πνεῦμα, Ἅγιον καλουμένη, δι' ἧς τοὺς Ἀγγέλους ἐκτίσα, οἱ δὲ Ἀγγελοὶ τὸν κόσμον ἐκτίσαν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.



rather to understand, that, intending to adulterate the Christian faith by bringing in a counterfeit imitation of it, on purpose he pretended himself and his "conceit" to be both one, because he knew, that according to the Christian faith both Father and Son (both which he pretended to be, as you have heard) are one and the same God with the Holy Ghost; which he pretended his "conceit" to be, according to Epiphanius, but himself among the Gentiles, according to Irenæus.

C H A P.  
XII.

§ 17. The heresy of his scholar Menander is thus described by Irenæus, i. 21: "*Qui primam quidem virtutem incognitam ait omnibus, se autem eum esse qui missus sit ab invisibilibus salvatorem pro salute hominum; mundum autem factum ab angelis, quos et ipse (similiter ut Simon) ab ennæa emissos dicit*"—"Who saith, that the first power is unknown to all, and that himself was the saviour that was sent by the invisible powers for the salvation of men; but that the world was made by the angels, whom he also, like as Simon, says, were put forth by the Father's conceit". Where you see, above the angels, whom he maketh creators of the world, the unknown Father, whom he pretendeth to make known, His "conceit," from whence the angels came, and the invisible powers, that sent him for the saviour of the world.

[Menander.]

§ 18. Both these then, pretending to be that which our Lord Christ indeed and in truth is, did make themselves one ingredient or parcel of that unknown and invisible Godhead; from whence they so made the angels to proceed, that nevertheless, banding a faction against the same, they make the coming of a saviour necessary for this end—to deliver mankind from the servitude of these angels, that made the world.

§ 19. As for Saturninus, pretending the Father of all to be unknown (otherwise than as he pretended to make Him

[Saturninus.]

Epiphan., Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 21. § 2; Op., tom. i. p. 56. C.—"Hic (Simon) Helenam quandam, quam ipse a Tyro civitate Phœnices quæstuariam cum redemisset, secum circumducebat, dicens hanc esse primam mentis ejus conceptionem, matrem omnium, per quam in initio mente concepit angelos facere et archangelos. Hanc enim Ennoiam exilientem ex

eo, cognoscentem quæ vult pater ejus, degredi ad inferiora, et generare angelos et potestates, a quibus et mundum hunc factum dixit." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 20; pp. 94. b, 95. a.—See above, § 2. note y; and Burton, Lect. iv. p. 107, and Note 47. pp. 390—393.

† Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 21; p. 96. a.—See above, § 2. notes b—d.

BOOK  
II.

known), it appears why he is among the Gnostics. But he pretends, that two sorts of men were made by the angels: one by the good, being an image of the power which is above; which being infinitely taken with, they said, "Let us make man after our image," because it was instantly withdrawn from their sight; but so that it had not come to life, had not the power above struck a spark of light into it: the other by the devils, which the Saviour, who is indeed unknown, [and] only seemed a man, came to subdue. So Irenæus, i. 22s.

[Basilides.]

§ 20. But Basilides, "*ut altius aliquid et verisimilius adinvenisse videatur, in immensum extendit sententiam doctrinæ suæ, ostendens Nun primo ab innato natum Patre, ab hoc autem natum Logon, deinde a Logo Phronesin, a Phronesi autem natas Sophiam et Dynamin, a Dynamini autem et Sophia Virtutes et Principes et Angelos, quos et primos vocat,*" saith Irenæus, i. 23:—"He, that he may seem to have added some higher thing, and more likely, to their invention, extending the meaning of his position beyond all bounds, shews, that Nus" (or Meaning) "was first born of the Father, Who was not born; of him Logos" (Reason or the Word), "of him Prudence, of it Wisdom and Power, of them Virtues, Princes, and Angels, whom he calls the prime ones<sup>b</sup>." Where you see manifestly the fulness of the Godhead is made to consist of the titles and attributes of our Lord Christ.

[Valentinus and others.]

§ 21. Which Valentinus after these makes to consist in thirty Æones, or intelligible worlds; which he derives from

<sup>a</sup> "Saturninus quidem, similiter ut Menander, unum Patrem incognitum omnibus ostendit, Qui fecit angelos, archangelos, virtutes, potestates. A septem autem quibusdam angelis mundum factum et omnia quæ in eo. Hominem autem angelorum esse facturam, desursum a summa potestate lucida imagine apparente, quam cum continere non possissent, inquit, eo quod statim recurreret sursum, adhortati sunt semetipsos dicentes, 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem:' qui cum factus esset, et non potuisset erigi plasma propter imbecillitatem angelorum sed quasi vermiculus scarizaret, miserantem ejus desuper Virtutem, quoniam in similitudinem ejus esset factus, emisisse scintillam vitæ, quæ erexit hominem et arti-

culavit et vivere fecit. . . Salvatorem autem innatum demonstravit et incorporalem et sine figura, putative autem visum hominem. Et Judæorum Deum unum ex angelis esse dixit: et propter hoc quod dissolvere voluerint patrem ejus omnes principes, advenisse Christum ad destructionem Judæorum Dei et ad salutem credentium ei; esse autem hos, qui habent scintillam vitæ ejus. Duo enim genera hic primus hominum plasmata esse ab angelis dixit, alterum quidem nequam, alterum autem bonum. Et quoniam dæmones pessimos adjuvabant, venisse Salvatorem ad dissolutionem malorum hominum et dæmonum, ad salutem autem bonorum." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 22; pp. 96. a, b. 97. a, b.

<sup>b</sup> Iren., ibid. c. 23; p. 97. a.



the unknown Father, and Silence or His Conceit and Grace (Bythos or the bottom, and Charis, Ennœa, or Sige), in whom he placed the first source of this "fulness!" And it hath been observed already, that his number of thirty is the same that the heathen gods are contrived into by Hesiod's Theogonia<sup>k</sup>. Much to my purpose. For St. Cyril, Catech. vi.<sup>l</sup>, calls Valentine "ὁ θεῶν καταγγεληῆς"—"the preacher of the thirty gods:" this fulness of the Godhead which they taught, being the deity which they worshipped. As did also not only Ptolemæus<sup>m</sup> and Secundus<sup>n</sup>, who followed Valentine, and changed what they thought fit in his design; or the Gnostics which followed Nicolas, as you may see by Epiphanius<sup>o</sup>: but the rest, from Simon Magus; whose followers worshipped him and his trull Selene, under the images of Jupiter and Minerva, saith Irenæus<sup>p</sup> expressly. For Menander's "first power," and the "ennœa" or "conceit" thereof, and the "invisible powers," by whom and from whom he pretended to be sent for the saviour of mankind<sup>q</sup>, shew, that this was that fulness of the Godhead in which he taught his followers to believe. And when Epiphanius, confuting Saturninus, saith, that (according to him) "οὐδὲ ἐν πλήρωμα εὑρεθήσεται ἐν τῇ ἄνω δυνάμει"—"there shall be found no fulness in the power above;" it is manifest, that he taught his followers to worship that "fulness" which Epiphanius refuteth. Simon Magus himself meant the like, when he

<sup>k</sup> "Λέγουσι γάρ" (Valentiniani) "τινὰ εἶναι ἐν ἀοράτοις καὶ ἀκατονομάστοις ὑψώμασι τέλειον Διῶνα προύντα, τοῦτον δὲ καὶ προπάτορα καὶ Βυθὸν καλοῦσιν. Ἰσχυρόντα δ' αὐτὸν ἀχώρητον καὶ ἀόρατον, δίδόν τε καὶ ἀγέννητον, ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἡρεμίᾳ πολλῇ γεγονέναι ἐν ἀπείροις αἰώσι χρόνων. Συνπαρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Ἐννοίαν, ἣν δὴ καὶ Χάριν καὶ Σιγὴν ὀνομάζουσιν," κ.τ.λ. "Οἱ τοὶ εἰσὶν οἱ τριάκοντα Διῶνες τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν." Epiphanius, Adv. Hæc., lib. I. tom. ii. Hæc. 31. § 10; Op., tom. i. pp. 175. A—176. B. And so Iren., Adv. Hæc., lib. i. c. 5; pp. 49 sq.—See also Iren., Adv. Hæc., lib. i. c. 1. § 1. pp. 7—9.—Epiphanius, Adv. Hæc., lib. I. tom. ii. Hæc. 31. § 2; Op., tom. i. pp. 164. A—165. C.—Burton, Note 48. pp. 393—397.

<sup>l</sup> "Ὁθεν καὶ τὸ μύημα τῆς κατὰ τὸν Ἡσιόδου Θεογονίας τῶν πατρῶν."

<sup>m</sup> Ἡσιόδῳ τριάκοντα Θεῶν λεγομένων, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ἐθνόμενον ποίησιν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν λαβὼν," κ.τ.λ. Epiphanius, as quoted in note i, § 2; p. 164. B.

<sup>n</sup> "Καὶ ὁ Οὐβαλεντίνος τριάκοντα Θεῶν καταγγελεύς." S. Cyril. Hieros., Catech. vi. § 17; Op., p. 97. C. ed. Bened.

<sup>o</sup> Epiphanius, Adv. Hæc., lib. I. tom. ii. Hæc. 33. § 1; Op., tom. i. pp. 214. D, 215. A.

<sup>p</sup> Id., ibid., Hæc. 32. § 1; ibid., p. 208. B, C.

<sup>q</sup> Id., ibid., Hæc. 25: ibid., pp. 72. B: sq.

<sup>r</sup> "Imaginem quoque Simonis habent factam ad figuram Jovis, et Helenæ in figuram Minervæ; et has adorant." Iren., Adv. Hæc., lib. i. c. 20. p. 95. b.

<sup>s</sup> See above, § 17. note f.

<sup>t</sup> Epiphanius, Adv. Hæc., lib. I. tom. ii. Hæc. 23. § 4; Op., tom. i. p. 65. B.

BOOK  
II.[Cerin-  
thus.][“ἀνα-  
πταντα.”]

said, according to Epiphanius, that the angels, though they proceeded from his “ennœa” or “conceit,” yet were without the “fulness,” that is, not comprehended within it.

§ 22. As for Cerinthus, whom all agree to have made our Lord Jesus the Son of Joseph and Mary, born as other men are<sup>t</sup>, Epiphanius says further of his sense: “Ἄνωθεν δὲ, ἐκ τοῦ ἄνω Θεοῦ, μετὰ τὸ ἀδρυνθῆναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας γεγεννημένον, κατεληλυθέναι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς Αὐτὸν, τουτέστι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἐν εἵδει περιστερᾶς, ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ ἀποκαλύψαι Αὐτῷ καὶ δι’ Αὐτοῦ τοῖς μετ’ Αὐτοῦ τὸν ἄγνωστον Πατέρα· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ἐπειδὴ ἦλθεν ἡ δύναμις εἰς Αὐτὸν ἄνωθεν, δυνάμεις ἐπιτετελεκέναι, καὶ Αὐτοῦ πεπονθότος, τὸ ἐλθὼν ἄνωθεν ἀναπτῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἄνω· πεπονθότα δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πάλιν ἐγγηγερμένον Χριστὸν δὲ τὸν ἄνωθεν ἐλθόντα εἰς Αὐτὸν ἀπαθῆ ἀναπτῆναι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ κατελθὼν ἐν εἵδει περιστερᾶς, καὶ οὐ τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν”—“But that after Jesus was grown a man, Who was born of the seed of Joseph and Mary, the Christ came down upon Him from the God that is above; that is, the Holy Ghost in the shape of a dove at Jordan; and revealed to Him the Father that was unknown, and by Him to His disciples; whereby, after the power came down upon Him from above, He did miracles: and that, when He had suffered, that which came from above flew up again from Jesus; so that Jesus suffered, and rose again, but the Christ which came upon Him from above flew up again without suffering, which is that which came down in the shape of a dove, and that Jesus is not the Christ.” Where, you see, he makes the coming of Christ to be nothing else but an escape made by the Holy Ghost, when He came upon our Lord, out of the “fulness of the Godhead;” to return thither again when He had suffered. Now it is agreed upon, that Cerinthus had spread his heresies in Asia, when St. John writ his Gospel<sup>x</sup>. And though Epiphanius report,

<sup>s</sup> Epiphanius (ibid., Hær. 21. § 2; ibid., p. 56. C) asserts the former and implies the latter tenet. See the passage in § 16. note e.

<sup>t</sup> “Fuisse Eum (Jesum) Joseph et Mariæ filium, similiter ut reliqui homines.” Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 25. p. 103. So also Epiphanius (Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 28. § 1; Op.,

tom. i. p. 110. D), and Theodoret (Hær. Fab., lib. ii. c. 3; Op., tom. iv. p. 219. C). See Burton, Note 75. pp. 478—480.

<sup>u</sup> Epiphan., as cited in note t, pp. 110. D, 111. A.

<sup>x</sup> See authorities in Burton, Note 73. pp. 475, 476: and above, § 9. note f.



that it was Ebion whom St. John met with in the bath, and refused to come in it so long as he was there, calling away his scholars with him<sup>7</sup>; yet it must be resolved, that it is a mere mistake of his memory: because himself testifies, as afore<sup>8</sup>, that the heresy of Cerinthus flourished in Asia and in Galatia, and because Eusebius<sup>9</sup>, after Irenæus<sup>b</sup> (who conversed with St. John's scholar Polycarpus<sup>c</sup>), reports it of Cerinthus.

§ 23. As for the heresy of Ebion, it is manifest by Epiphanius himself, in his Heresies<sup>d</sup>, that it sprung up first, and flourished most, in the parts of Palestine beyond or besides Jordan, which they called Peræa; what time the Church of Jerusalem had forsaken the city, to remove themselves to Pella, where God had provided for them at the destruction of it. So that it appeareth not, that St. John saw the birth of it, being probably removed into Asia before that time<sup>e</sup>. I shall therefore need to say nothing of the heresy of Ebion, having St. Jerome (*in Catalogo*<sup>f</sup>) to witness, that the Gospel of St. John was written at the request of the bishops of Asia in opposition to Cerinthus. But the stock of that evidence which I shall bring out of the Scripture, for the state of our Lord Christ and His Godhead before His coming in the flesh, lying therefore in the beginning of that Gospel which was writ on purpose to exclude it, I shall refer the rest of that which I shall gather out of the New Testament, to the sense and effect of it.

<sup>7</sup> Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 30. § 24; Op., tom. i. p. 148. C. "By a slip of the memory, as it appears, he (Epiphanius) has put the name of Ebion for that of Cerinthus. . . Baronius thinks that the anecdote may be true of Ebion as well as of Cerinthus." Burton, p. 475. Epiphanius relates the story while describing the heresy of the Ebionites, not that of the Cerinthians.

<sup>8</sup> Epiphani., *ibid.*, Hær. 28. § 6; Op., tom. i. p. 114. A, B. See above, § 9. note f.

<sup>9</sup> Euseb., H. E., lib. iii. c. 28; p. 100. C, D.

<sup>b</sup> Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. iii. c. 11. p. 218. A.

<sup>c</sup> Iren., *ibid.*, c. 3. p. 203; and Epist. ad Florin., *ibid.*, p. 464 (and in Euseb., H. E., lib. v. c. 20. n. 128. A—C).

<sup>d</sup> "Γὰρ τὴν τῶν ἑβίων ἑρесь μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου μεταστάσιν, καὶ ἐκεῖσε διατριβόντων αὐτῶν, γέγονεν ἐκ τούτου πρόφασις τῷ Ἑβίωνι." Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. I. tom. ii. Hær. 30. § 2; Op., tom. i. p. 126. B, C.

<sup>e</sup> St. John's removal to Asia is usually dated about A.D. 66. So Baronius, Tillemont, &c.

<sup>f</sup> "Scripsit Evangelium (Johannes Apostolus), rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis, adversus Cerinthus aliosque hæreticos et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse." S. Hieron., Catal. Script. Eccles., c. ix. De Joh. Apost.; Op., tom. IV. P. ii. p. 105.

BOOK  
II.

## CHAPTER XIII.

8

THE WORD WAS AT THE BEGINNING OF ALL THINGS. THE APPARITIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PREFACES TO THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST. AMBASSADORS ARE NOT HONOURED WITH THE HONOUR DUE TO THEIR MASTERS. THE WORD OF GOD THAT WAS AFTERWARDS INCARNATE, WAS IN THOSE ANGELS THAT SPOKE IN GOD'S NAME. NO ANGEL HONOURED AS GOD UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT. THE WORD WAS WITH GOD AT THE BEGINNING OF ALL THINGS AS AFTER HIS RETURN.

The Word  
was at the  
beginning  
of all  
things.  
[John i.  
1, 2.]

THE Gospel of St. John then beginneth thus: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God." In which words the Socinians will not have "the beginning" to be the beginning of all things, but the beginning of preaching the Gospel; that is to say, when John the Baptist began to preach: and "the Word" to be the Man Jesus, so called because He was the Man Whom God had appointed to publish it. So that, "In the beginning was the Word," is, in their sense,—when John the Baptist began to preach, there was a Man whom God had appointed to publish the Gospels. And, truly, I cannot deny, that "the beginning" here might signify the beginning of the Gospel; by the same reason, as in the Scripture, and in all languages, words signify more than they express. But that reason can be no other than this,—because a man speaks of things mentioned afore in discourse, or of that which is otherwise known to be the subject of his discourse. So words signify more than they express, because something that is known

§ "Nusquam reperies in Sacris Literis principium pro æternitate usurpari. Quapropter nomen principii in his verbis" (Joh. i. 1), "non æternitatem, sed ordinem earum rerum respicere dicemus, quas Johannes de Jesu Christo dilectissimo Dei Filio scripturus est. . . . Johannes 'Verbi' nomine ipsum Dominum Jesum Christum . . . intelligit, non ob aliquam Ejus naturam aut substantiam, sed muneris tantum causa quo Ipse Dei Filius functus est, dum evangelicum Patris Sui verbum exponeret. . . . Summa hæc est; Scripturus Johannes de Domino nostro

Jesu Christo Dei Filio," &c. "altius ante Illius patefactionem orditur, dicens, 'In principio erat Verbum,' hoc est, Christus Dei Filius, in principio Evangelii, eo nimirum tempore, quo Johannes Baptista ad frugem Israelitarum populum revocare cepit, et antequam ipsius Baptistæ prædicatione Judæis innotuisset, jam erat, et erat a Deo huic muneri, voluntatem Suam scilicet patefaciendi, destinatus." Socin., Explic. Primi Capit. Johannis Evang., Op., tom. i. pp. 78. a, 79. a.—So also Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. V. c. xiii. p. 484. j



need not be repeated at every turn. What is the reason CHAP. XIII.  
then, why this addition, not being expressed, is to be under-  
stood? Forsooth St. Mark beginneth his Gospel<sup>h</sup> thus:

"The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God: as it is written in the prophets, 'Behold I send My Messenger before Thy face, that shall prepare Thy way before Thee: the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His path plain:' John was baptizing in the wilderness." Is not this a good reason? Because in one text of St. Mark you find the beginning of the Gospel to be the preaching of John, therefore, where-soever you read "the beginning," you are to understand by it the beginning of the Gospel. At least, in the beginning of St. John's Gospel we must seek no other meaning for it. But who will warrant, that the word Gospel in St. Mark signifies the preaching of the Gospel, as sometimes it does, or this book of the Gospel, which St. Mark takes in hand to write<sup>1</sup>? The words, it is manifest, may signify either; and therefore it cannot be manifest, that the word "beginning," without any addition, is put to signify the one and not the other. For if you understand the beginning of the book of the Gospel, when St. John says, "In the beginning was the Word," their turn is not served.

§ 2. As for the title of "The Word," which scarce any of the Apostles but St. John attributes to our Lord, look upon the beginning of his first Epistle: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard and seen, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life (for the Life hath been manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you that everlasting Life, Which was with the Father and hath been manifested unto us); that which we have heard and seen, declare we unto you." Here it must be a man, that St. John calls "the Word," when he speaks not only of hearing, but of seeing and handling the Word of

<sup>h</sup> "Nam Evangelii principium a Baptistæ prædicatione ducendam esse ex Marco liquido constat, Marc. i. 1; quem hic noster, quod ad 'principii' nomen attinet, auctorem habet." Socin., *ibid.*, p. 79. a.—So also Volkel., *ibid.*; and *lib. III. c. iii. pp. 41, 42.*

<sup>1</sup> "Evangelium" hic dicitur,

Evangelica narratio, cujus inquit initium hoc est: vel Novum Testamentum, ut significet Marcus Johannem fuisse finem Veteris, initium Novi, Testamenti: vel ipsum *κῆρυγμα* a Christo pronunciatum." Poli Synops., ad Marc. i. 1.

[Mark i. 1—4.]

[“paths straight.” Eng. vers.]

[What is meant by the Word.]  
[1 John i. 1—3.]

BOOK  
II.

Life: but when he says, that "the Word was with God from the beginning," and since "hath been made manifest to us," is there nothing but the Man, and His office of preaching the Gospel, to be considered, for the reason why He is called the Word? What meant then the Apostle, Heb. iv. 12, 13:—"The Word of God is quick and active, and cutteth beyond any two-edged sword; and cometh so far as to divide between the soul and the spirit, to the joints and marrow, and judgeth the thoughts and conceits of the heart; neither is any creature obscure to it, but all things naked and bare to the eyes of Him Whom we have to do with:"—where, you see, he begins his discourse concerning the Gospel, but ends it in God: and therefore attributes to the Gospel, under the name of "The Word," those things which only God can do; because to the author of it, under the name of "The Word," he attributes the knowledge and governing of all things. For the reason, then, why our Lord is called "The Word," we must have recourse to that which the most ancient fathers of the Church, Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>k</sup>, Tertullian<sup>l</sup>, Origen<sup>m</sup>, and others<sup>n</sup>, with Justin the Martyr<sup>o</sup>, have taught us;

<sup>k</sup> "Τῷ Σωτῆρι τῷ Κυρίῳ" (viz. Christ the Word) "προσδράμωμεν," *Os καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ προὔτρεπεν εἰς σωτηρίαν, διὰ τερμάτων καὶ σημείων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἐν ἐρήμῳ διὰ τῆς βάτου, καὶ τῆς ἀκολούθουσης, χάριτι φιλανθρωπίας, θεραπείης δίκης, Ἑβραίοις νεφέλης,*" κ.τ.λ. Clem. Alex., Cohort. ad Gentes, § 1; Op., pp. 7, 8. So also in even plainer terms in his *Pædagogus*, lib. i. c. 7; *ibid.*, pp. 131, 132. These and the passages quoted in the following notes may be found cited with several others by Burton, *Testimonies of Antenicene Fathers*, pp. 38—40: Bp. Bull, *Defens. Fid. Nic.*, Sect. IV. c. iii. § 1 sq.; *Works*, vol. V. P. ii. pp. 730 sq.; *Waterland, Defence of some Queries*, &c., Qu. ii.; *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 20—33.

<sup>l</sup> "Nam qui ad Moysen loquebatur, Ipse erat Dei Filius, Qui et semper videbatur. Deum enim Patrem nemo vidit unquam et vixit: et ideo constat Ipsum Dei Filium Moysi esse locutum, et dixisse ad populum, Ecce Ego mitto angelum Meum ante faciem tuam, id est, populi," &c. Tertull., *Adv. Judæos*, c. ix.; Op., pp. 142. F, 143. A. So also, *Adv. Praxeam*, cc. xiii., xvi.; Op., pp. 849. B, 851. B:

*Adv. Marc.*, lib. iii. c. 9; *ibid.*, p. 672. F.

<sup>m</sup> Origen., In *Genes. Hom.* iv. § 3: Op., tom. ii. p. 72. I. A. ed. Bened.: et *Hom.* viii. § 8; *ibid.*, p. 83. I. A, B: In *Levit. Hom.* iv. § 1; *ibid.*, p. 199. 2. b.

<sup>n</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, lib. iii. c. 6; pp. 208, 209: lib. iv. cc. 11, 12; p. 282.—S. Cyprian., *Testim. adv. Jud.*, lib. ii. cc. 5, 6; Op., pp. 33—36. ed. Fell.—Novatian., *De Trinitate*, cc. xxv.—xxvii.; ad calc. Op. Tertull., pp. 1047. A—1050. D. Rothom. 1662.—Concil. Antioch. (A.D. 266) *adv. Paul. Samosat.*, *Epist. Episcop. Orthod.*; ap. Labb., *Concil.*, tom. i. pp. 846. C—847. A: or Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.*, vol. ii. pp. 468—470. Oxon. 1814.—Euseb., *Demonst. Evangel.*, lib. v. (throughout), pp. 202 sq.—Theophil. Antiochen., *Ad Autol.*, lib. ii. c. 14; p. 120. ed. J. Chr. Wolf. Hamb. 1724.—Tract. I. *De Fide Orthod.*, c. xv.; in *Append. ad Op. S. Greg. Naz.*, tom. i. p. 102. ed. Bened.

<sup>o</sup> "Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν ἡγησάμενοι ἀεὶ τὸν Πατέρα τῶν ὄλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεὶ τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὕπνῳ 'Τίς Θεοῦ, . . . δικαίως ἐλέγχονται,' " *Καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς*



—that God spake unto the fathers of the Old Testament by the ministry of the same Second Person of the Trinity, by Whom in our flesh the Gospel was intended to be published in the last ages of the world; and that therefore our Lord Christ is called “The Word of God.”

§ 3. The Socinians think they have said enough to refute and renounce this advantage, which Christianity hath always used against the Jews, when, with the Jews, they have alleged, that all those apparitions which those fathers believe were ministered by our Lord Christ, were the apparitions of mere angels, among whom one, as principal in the commission, represented the person of God, and (in that regard) is both called by the proper name of God not communicable to any creature (which we, I know not by what right, translate Jehovah, seeing it is a thing manifest, that our Lord Christ and His Apostles did not pronounce it, as it is certain the Jews, among whom they lived, did not at that time<sup>p</sup>), and also worshipped with the honour that is properly due to God alone<sup>q</sup>. And truly, that it was always some angel, that is

CHAP.  
XIII.

The apparitions of the Old Testament prefaces to the incarnation of Christ.

καὶ εἰκόνας ἀσωμάτων τῷ Μωσῇ καὶ τοῖς ἑτέροις προφήταις ἐφάνη· νῦν δὲ ἐν χρόνοις τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς . . . διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος,” κ. τ. λ. Just. Mart., Apol. Ima, c. lxiii.; Op., pp. 81. E, 82. A. And so also c. lxii. ibid., pp. 80. D—81. A: and Dial. cum Tryph., cc. lvi.—lxii.; ibid., pp. 150. D—160. A: c. cxxv.; ibid., p. 218. C, D.: cc. cxxvi., cxxvii.; ibid., pp. 219. A—221. B.

“Καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ” (Μωϋσῇ) “σημαίνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προσηγορίαν, οὐ πρότερον εἰς ἀνθρώπους παρελθοῦσαν· περὶ ἧς οὐ μοι θέμις εἰπεῖν.” Joseph., Antiq. Jud., lib. II. c. xii. § 4; Op., tom. i. p. 82. ed. Hudson.—“Ὁνόματος” (scil. τὸ τετραγράμματον), “ὃ μόνοις τοῖς ᾧτα καὶ γλῶτταν σοφία κεκαθαμένοις θέμις ἀκούειν καὶ λέγειν ἐν ἁγίοις, ἄλλω δ’ οὐδενὶ τὸ παράπαν οὐδαμοῦ.” Philo, Vit. Mosis, lib. iii.; Op., tom. ii. p. 152. ed. Mangey.—“Hanc consuetudinem jam LXX interpretum ætate invaluisse, ex eo constat, quod his ubique יהוה reddunt δ Κύριος (יהוה): eandemque Samaritani sequebantur, ita tamen ut pro יהוה efferrent יהושי.”

Gesen, in voc. יהוה (quoting also hom may be found the as to the true pro- See also Cal-

met, Diction., art. Jehovah, for authorities on the subject.

“Nunc id quod de hoc nomine” (scil. Jehovah) “angelis tributo diximus, exsequamur. Angeli cum in seipsis spectantur, a Jehova, ut ministri a domino, ut nuncii a mittente, distinguuntur. Sed nonnunquam, Deo ita volente, Ipsius personam assumunt, et tunc quodvis Ipsius nomen et ipsi sibi tribuunt et ab aliis sibi tribui patiuntur. Non secus enim se gerunt ac loquuntur, ac si Ipsemet adesset Deus. Non alia proculdubio de causa, quam ut tanto plus auctoritatis habeat res et oratio, ut in auditorum animos altius descendat. . . . Angeli Dei personam ita sustinent ut Ejus auctoritatem simul habeant. . . . Quam ob causam ita olim Deus præcepit de angelo quem esset missurus ut Israelitis in itinere defenderet et in terram ipsis destinatam introduceret. ‘Cave,’ inquit, ‘a facie ejus,’” &c. “Nomen Meum in ipso est,” q. d. personam Meam sustinet, Mea auctoritate ac potestate instructus. Non solent eandem rationem principum personas assumendi ac loquendi formam servare legati. Cum enim nemo non aliam ipsorum principum quam legatorum personam animo concipiat, minus vel gratiæ vel gravitatis habitura esset alienæ personæ assumtio. At

BOOK II. called by the proper name of God and worshipped as God by the fathers in their apparitions, is a thing so manifest through the Scriptures, that I will not undertake any unnecessary trouble to prove it. Neither do I think this any thing prejudicial to that which the fathers of the Church teach. For when they deliver, that these apparitions were of the nature of prefaces and preambles to the apparition of the Word in our flesh, it seems to be supposed, that, as the Word at the last assumed our flesh wherein to appear, which afterwards He was never to let go again (according to the saying of divines after St. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>r</sup>, "*Quod semel accepit, nunquam dimisit*"), so at the first He was wont to assume some angelical nature, wherein He might appear, to deal with men; though not to retain it for ever, but to dismiss it, the business for which it was assumed being done.

§ 4. Neither is that any thing difficult, which may be objected<sup>s</sup>,—that these angels did take unto them usually the bodies of men, in which they might converse with men; and therefore that, when they are called by the name, and worshipped with the honour, of the only true God, there being something visible to which these things cannot be attributed, they must be ascribed to the invisible nature of the angels; not for itself (which were idolatry), but in regard of God, Whose person they represent as ambassadors, and therefore are honoured with the honour due to the prince whom they represent: as the Jews<sup>t</sup>, and with them the Soci-

angeli Deum hominibus representarunt inconspicuum, nunquam visum, nunquam mortalibus videndum. Ejus autem, qua de nunc agimus, rei exemplum habes in apparitione Dei Abrahamo facta. In ea angelus unus, duobus aliis comitatus, non secus ac Deus Ipse loquitur, ac 'Dominus' seu 'Jehova' non semel appellatur, eoque a cæteris duobus satis aperte distinguitur. Hinc vulgo hodie arbitrantur, Deum Summum revera adfuisse: multi etiam, tres Divinitatis Personas virorum specie apparuisse. Sed . . . aliud D. Auctor Epistolæ ad Hebr. docet. Is hospitalitatem commendaturus quosdam ait inscios ejus virtutis beneficio excepisse hospitio angelos," &c. &c.; and lower down, "Etiam tandem obtineretur, iis in locis ubi angelum legimus Jehovah appellatum, Christum esse intelligendum; non esset tamen statuendum, Eum

Ipsummet fuisse Jehovah: sed ex angelorum numero aliquem, qui Dei Summi personam sustinens, Nomen etiam Ejus usurpavit: cum inter se pugnare videamus, angelum esse, et quidem Jehovah, Qui Unus tantum est, et esse Ipsummet Jehovah." Crellius, De Deo; being lib. i. of Volkelius, De Vera Relig., c. xi. pp. 79; 80. 82.

<sup>r</sup> See S. Greg. Naz., Epist. i. ad Cleod., Epist. ci.; Op., tom. ii. p. 86. C. &c.

<sup>s</sup> "The Jews and Socinians say, that the angels are worshipped for God as His ambassadors. I, as I prove it not in that regard, so I am to prove, that setting aside their assumed bodies they were so honoured." Added in marg. in MS.

<sup>t</sup> See Allix, Judgm. of Anc. Jewish Ch. against the Unitarians. xv.; who disproves this the modern Jews by the ancient.



nians<sup>u</sup>, do understand those titles, wheresoever in the Old Testament they are attributed to angels. This were something indeed, if it were not manifest, that the proper name of God is attributed to those angels, by whom God deals with men, without assuming to them men's bodies. There is nothing of this kind more eminent than that of Moses, Exod. xxiii. 20—22: "Behold, I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared: look to thyself because of him, and hear his voice; provoke him not, for he will not pardon your apostacy; for My name is in the midst of him: but if thou shalt hearken to his voice, and shalt do all that I shall speak, I will be an enemy to thine enemies and persecute thy persecutors." For afterwards, when they had sinned, and God proffers to send an angel with them to drive out their enemies, because, if He should go Himself among them, and they rebel again, He should destroy them; it is manifest, that Moses is not content, till he hath obtained of God, that Himself would go<sup>91</sup> along with them. For before, when Moses had pitched the tabernacle without the camp, he spake with God face to face there, and the people worshipped towards that quarter: but afterwards, by his prayer he obtains, that God's face should go with them to give them rest, having otherwise no desire to venture upon the voyage: Exod. xxxiii. 2, 5, 9—11, 14—16. Whereby it is manifest, that the "face of God" in this place, is the same that is called in another place, "the angel of God's face," because he represented the person of God,<sup>9.]</sup> and therefore is called by the name of God, and the name of God is said to be in him; and Moses is said to talk "face to face with God," because he had conference with this angel in the name of God, who is called God, face to face: whereas, when God proffers barely an angel, he is not content, but insists upon this. And for this reason it is, that, whereas it is certain that the Law was "given by the ministry of angels," nevertheless it is said, that "God spake all" the ten commandments; because that angel that had the commission, and is called God, spake them. And afore, though it is certain, that it was the angel of God, who went before the  
 o of Israel in a pillar of a cloud by day and a pillar of

CHAP.  
XIII.

[Isai. lxiii.

9.]

[Acts vii.

53: Gal.

iii. 19:

Heb. ii. 2.]

[Exod. xx.

1.]

<sup>u</sup> See above, § 3. note q.

BOOK II. fire by night (because it is said, Exod. xiv. 19, "And the angel of the Lord that went before the camp of Israel, removed, and came behind them, and the pillar of cloud removed from before them, and stood behind them"), yet it is said, Exodus xiii. 21, that it was "the Lord," that went so before them. It is therefore manifest, that the name and worship of God is given to the angels that represent God, as well when they assume to themselves no bodies as when they do.

Ambassadors are not honoured with the honour due to their masters.

§ 5. As for that which the Jews, and with them the Socinians, allege,—that it is because ambassadors represent the persons of the princes that send them, and therefore are honoured with the honour that is properly due to them;—it is ridiculous, and against common sense. For, certainly, it is one thing to say, that ambassadors are honoured in consideration of the princes from whom they come; another, with the same honours. Ambassadors are strangers where they come ambassadors; and therefore, for their own sakes, must be respected where they come otherwise than at home, otherwise than their equals where they come: much more in respect of the princes from whence they come. But that any prince should honour the ambassador of any prince with the same honour wherewith he would honour his master if he were there, is ridiculous to imagine. Much less the ambassador of God, between Whom and any creature that He can employ upon any ambassage, there is incomparably more distance than between any prince and any subject he can use. Honour, inwardly, is nothing but the esteem a man hath of that which he honours; outwardly, nothing else but the signs whereby he expresseth it. And though the conceit which a man hath of God, is comparable with that which he hath with His creature, as both are representations to man's mind, and therefore in themselves of the same nature; yet the one represents God, incomparable to that which the other represents concerning the creature. As for the outward signs of honour, though they may be equivocal and ambiguous, yet there wants not means to determine, whether a man intend to express that esteem which is incomparable to any he can have of any creature, or not. This is the esteem which the proper name and worship of



God signifies: which if they who know not God should tender to a creature, they must be thought idolaters; if they which know God, they must know that God is in that creature, as Christians know that God is in Christ, Whom therefore they worship for God. CHAP. XIII.

§ 6. When, therefore, we find the fathers of the Old Testament worshipping the apparitions they had for God, when the Scriptures call them God, it is because God was in them for the time, as for ever in Christ; after Whose coming we do not find any angel called God, or worshipped for God. Not that before His coming all angels that come from God are called by the name of God; but that, where they are so called, so it was. For I need not stand here to shew, how many apparitions of angels are mentioned in the Old Testament, of whom there is none called by the proper name of God, or said to be worshipped by the prophets whom they deal with. The Word of God That was afterwards incarnate, was in those angels that spake in God's Name.

92 § 7. It is true, St. John in the New Testament, two several times, tenders the angel that appears to him that worship which he refuseth; Apoc. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9. But though he says, in refusing it, "worship God;" yet doth it not appear, nor is it of itself any way credible, that St. John should be so surprised as to honour and esteem the angel as God, whom he knew to be sent by God. For to bid him reserve unto God that honour which he refuses, is to bid him reserve unto God that honour, which is incomparably more than that which he refuseth. And who is it that can say or imagine, that Cornelius intended to worship St. Peter for God, because he tenders him that honour which St. Peter refuseth (Acts x. 26), saying, "Arise, I also am a man:" being one, whose religion was to worship the only true God, Whose servant he thought St. Peter to be? And therefore I shall not need to say that which otherwise I should have said: that St. John knew not this difference between the dispensation of God in the Old and New Testament, nor the reason why the fathers worshipped those angels that dealt with them in God's name, which out of this difference may be observed; to wit, because the Word of God (Who at this time had assumed our flesh in the womb of the Virgin, subsisting therefore by the Word Which assumed it, and not to be dismissed No angel honoured as God under the New Testament.

BOOK  
II.

any more) formerly assumed an angel subsisting afore, to deal with man by, and therefore dismissed him again when the business was done.

The Word  
was with  
God at the  
beginning  
of all  
things as  
after His  
return.

§ 8. Let us now compare that sense which these words create, according to Socinus, with that which followeth from the premises: and then I will be willing to leave it to the reader to choose. For is it not a great secret which the Evangelist discovers by these words, in his sense,—that, when St. John Baptist began to preach, there was such a man in the world, as He Whom God had appointed to publish the Gospel? Is it that which he needed tell them, that knew all before that there was six months between their ages? Or did it not concern them to know, that the same Word of God, Which dealt with the fathers, Which by and by he means to tell them was incarnate, the same was from the beginning; that is to say, to the confusion of Arius no less than of Socinus, from everlasting? Was it not to the purpose, to settle that which Cerinthus undermined, upon the same credit upon which they were Christians?

[This sense  
required by  
other texts  
in St.  
John's  
Gospel.]

§ 9. Proceed we now to that which follows: and we shall find, that if we admit Socinus his sense, when St. John says, "The Word was with God," and afterwards, "The same was in the beginning with God;" I say, if we admit the sense of these words to be this, that what time St. John Baptist preached, Jesus was with God in heaven, we shall not give an account of those things which He says of Himself in the Gospel, pertinent to Christianity: which according to the sense of the Church we shall do. John iii. 11—13, our Saviour saith to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that We know, and We witness what We have seen, but ye receive not Our witness: if I have said to you earthly things and ye believe not, how will ye believe if I tell you heavenly? and no man is gone up into heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man that is in heaven." Again, John v. 19, 20, 30, our Lord, giving a reason why He bad the man whom He had cured take up his bed and walk, "answers and says to them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of Himself except He see the Father do something; for what He doth, the same doth likewise the Son: for the Father



loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all that He doth; and will shew Him greater things than these, that ye may marvel." And to the same effect our Lord saith to the Jews, John viii. 38; "I speak what I have seen with My Father, and therefore ye do what ye have seen with your father;" or, "at your and My Father's house"—"*παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ Μου—ἰμῶν.*" So, John vi. 46, 50, 51, 58, 62: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, but He that comes from God; He hath seen the Father:" and, "This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat of it and not die; I am the living bread that is come down from heaven:" and again, "This is the bread that is come down from heaven:" and last of all, "What then if you see the Son of man go up thither where He was before?" Finally, when our Lord, 93 now ready to leave the world, tells His disciples (John xvi. 28), "I came forth from My Father and came into the world; again, I leave the world and go to the Father:" I demand of all the world that read, and believe by these words, that our Lord going back to the Father stays there for everlasting; whether they can understand, when He affirms in the same form of words, that He "came from the Father," that He means only, that He had been with the Father since the Baptist began to preach<sup>\*</sup>; or that He had been there from everlasting before? When He saith, "What if you see Him go up thither where He was before?" that He had been there afore while the Baptist was preaching<sup>†</sup>, or that He had

\* See above, § 1. note g. "Quod vero ad tempus attinet" (viz. of the feigned ascension devised by Socinus), "plane verisimile est . . . illud tunc temporis factum esse cum Dominus Jesus jam baptizatus et Spiritu Sancto donatus quidem esset, munus vero Suum nondum obire cœpisset; cum scilicet quadraginta dies et totidem noctes jejunos in deserto consumpsit." Smalzius, De Divin. Christi, c. iv. p. 13. Racov. 1608.—And Volkel. also, but doubtfully; adding, "Neque quicquam rei istius veritati derogat, quod quo tempore hæc evenerint, affirmare non possumus." De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. v. p. 46: speaking of the same subject.

† See above, § 1. note g.—"Considerandum tibi verba" (scil. aliquo aut ei

esse. Si cum aliquo; nemo non videt, quam apte Christus ut homo in cœlo fuisse dici possit, antequam videntibus discipulis cum Suo Corpore eo ascenderit; cum perpetuo in cœlo mente Sua versaretur, cœlestiaque omnia ita cognita haberet, ut ea tanquam præsentia semper inspiceret: idque ratione quadam plane singulari, et præter ac supra omnem aliorum divinorum hominum sortem. Sin autem, ut mihi quidem videtur, nullo cum tropo sunt Christi verba accipienda; necesse est fateri, Ipsum ut hominem, aut certe postquam fuit homo, fuisse in cœlo ante ascensionem illam Suam Apostolis conspicuam. Quam sententiam ego vehementer probō." Socin., De Unig. Filii Dei Existentia inter Erasm. Johan. et F. S. Disput.; Op., tom. ii. p. 311. a.—See also Id., Resp. Prior ad

BOOK  
II.

been there afore, a while answerable to that while that He shall stay there after His going hence? When He saith, that they will not believe Him when He tells them heavenly things, because none of them have been in heaven, as the Son of man, Who, being come from heaven, notwithstanding remains in heaven: whether He mean only, that having been there in heaven, and learnt the effect of His commission, and being still there in heart as all Christians are, He can tell them things from heaven which they will not believe<sup>a</sup>; or that, having been in heaven, and not having forsaken it for His coming into the world, He knows the truth of all that He witnesses here, by seeing the counsels of God there, even while He is here? And that these are those things which He hath seen in His Father's house, to wit, those counsels, which the Father out of His love to Him had made Him acquainted with, and taught Him to execute, even as they had learnt in the devil's shop, their father, to execute his designs? For can any man imagine, that His being only born of the Virgin by the power of God (which is, they say, the Holy Ghost), is a sufficient reason, why God should not only shew Him what He meant to do for our salvation, but join Him with Himself in the work, and that honour for it, whereof no angel, that is, the highest creature, is capable<sup>a</sup>?

Paræn. Andr. Volani; *ibid.*, p. 380. a: and the passages cited below in note z.

<sup>z</sup> "Si tamen quispiam ita pertinax esse velit, ut nullum tropum . . . in rebus istis" (Joh. iii. 13) "admittere velit, nihil aliud restat nisi ut Filium Hominis, sive Hominem illum, et vere et proprie, jam tum et de cœlo descendisse et in cœlo fuisse dicamus. Quod nos sane non modo libenter concedimus sed etiam plane contendimus, nec ullo modo dubitandum esse dicimus, quin si Paulus antequam moreretur ad tertium usque cœlum raptus fuit, Jesus Ipse Nazarenus, ejus Magister et Dominus, in cœlo fuerit, ibique aliquamdiu ante mortem Suam, præsertim vero antequam munus Suum in terris obiret, commoratus fuerit." Socin., *Explic. Loc. S. S.*, in Joh. iii. 13; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 146. b.—"Si non proprie sed figurate accipienda sint" (verba Johan. iii. 13), "quid vetat, quominus ipse homo, id est, Christus, quatenus homo erat, tunc temporis in cœlo esse dictus

fuerit? An non in cœlo is esse figurate et eleganter dici potest, qui in cœlo semper mente versetur cœlestiaque omnia perfectissima et quasi præsentia perpetuo habeat?" *Id.*, *Resp. ad Vujek. de Divinitate Filii Dei*, &c., c. vii.; *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 610. a.—See also Volkcl., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. iii. c. v. pp. 45, 46; lib. v. c. xiii. pp. 491, 492; Slichtingius, *Comment. ad Joh. iii. 13*; tom. i. p. 27. b: ad Joh. vi. 38; *ibid.*, p. 49. b:—and above, c. x. § 5. note m: and the passages cited above in note y.

<sup>a</sup> See c. i. § 9. note y, c. x. § 5. note m, c. xiv. § 5. notes q, r.—"Ex Spiritu Sancto conceptus, et ex Virgine, inusitata plane ratione et naturæ limites excedente natus est; et hanc primam ob causam Filius Dei vocari meruit . . . Nam . . . jure propterea proprius atque unigenitus Dei Filius dici potest; quod et solus hac ratione in lucem editus sit, et statim a vitæ Suæ primordio Dei Filius extiterit, nec præter Deum ullum patrem habue-



Or that all this is such an expression as manhood can bear<sup>b</sup>, of that participation of God's counsels, which the Word having been acquainted with from everlasting, was no stranger to, while being in the world He was executing the same? Surely, when our Lord says, that He is to leave the world, to go back to the Father, He declares an intent to abide in heaven for everlasting. Therefore, when He says, He came forth from the Father to come into the world; to understand only, that He left the private life He had lived afore He began to preach, to appear publicly to the world in His office<sup>c</sup>, might justly be accounted a piece of frenzy, if there were not heresy in it: the opposition between heaven, where the Father is, and the world, being so manifest in the words, that nothing but the vainglory of maintaining a party could cause it to be overseen.

CHAP.  
XIII.

§ 10. If these things be true, we shall not need to go far for the sense of our Lord's words, John xvii. 5; "And now glorify Thou Me, O Father, with that glory which I had with Thee before the foundation of the world:" because we see how many times, in this Gospel, by "being with the Father" our Saviour expresseth (not His being in heaven when the Baptist began to preach, but) His being in heaven from the beginning of the world till He was born upon earth. For can any doubt be made, that "the glory which He had with the Father from the beginning," is that which He was to be exalted to at His rising again?

§ 11. As for that answer of His to the Jews, that demanded [How Soci-

nus an-

rit. Qua de causa et naturalis Dei Filius recte potest appellari. Cujus quidem nativitatis tam admirabilis duplex potissimum videtur fuisse causa. Primo enim voluit Eum Deus, tum illis quos hoc mysterium tunc minime latebat, tum illis qui postmodum ejus rei notitia instruendi essent, commendatissimum esse maximamque habere apud illos auctoritatem. Deinde consentaneum est, in ipso statim Ejus ortu, summo illi Patri spiritualium filiorum Suorum generationem hoc pacto adumbrare placuisse, ut, accedente postea Divinæ voluntatis disciplina, clarissime pateret qua ratione in filium Dei evadere eum oporteret qui ad sempiternam hereditatem contenderet." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. i. pp. 38, 39.

<sup>b</sup> "Hoc autem ita esse" (scil. the fictitious ascension of our Lord above spoken of), "apertissime patet ex Christi cum Nicodemo colloquio, ubi dicit Se quæ sciat loqui et quæ viderit testari; et tamen plurimos testimonium Suum aspernari, quævis ad humani ingenii captum orationem Suam valde accomodat. Magis itaque id facturos innuit, si, prout rerum illarum natura aliquo modo postulet, sublimi ac cælesti quadam ratione eas explicet." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xiii. p. 492.

<sup>c</sup> "Hic postremus loquendi modus" (scil. "in mundum veni") "id tantum significat, Christum publice inter homines prædicare cœpisse." Catech. Racov., sect. IV. c. i. De Persona Christi, p. 69. ed. 1680.

BOOK  
II.

swers John  
viii. 56—  
58.]

of Him (having said, "Abraham your father desired to see My day, and saw it, and rejoiced"), "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?" to which "Jesus answered and said, Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 56—58): I perceive the world is ashamed to hear, what Socinus is not ashamed to answer<sup>d</sup>; that the sense of the words is, and so they ought to be translated, 'before Abraham become Abraham;' or, 'before he become Abraham, I am:' meaning, that here you see Me, before the calling of the Gentiles, whereby the prophecy of Abraham's name ("father of a great people") is fulfilled. For the words "*πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι*," make both the name of Abraham to go before the verb in sense, and the verb to signify the time past: so that there must have been another *Ἀβραὰμ* after *γενέσθαι*, as well as this that goes afore; and if there had been so, it must have been translated,<sup>94</sup> 'before Abraham was Abraham,' or, 'before he was Abraham,' not 'before he become Abraham.' But for our Lord to say, "before Abraham was, I am," to wit, in the purpose of God<sup>e</sup>, is no less impertinent to their question, than to say, I am here before the calling of the Gentiles. And to imagine, that our Lord would give an answer utterly impertinent to their question, I know not how it can stand with His profession; though not to declare all that truth, which for the present they were not able to bear, may well stand with it.

<sup>d</sup> "Sed dices, At quid sibi volunt ea verba, Antequam Abraham fiat? Nunquid Abraham, qui ante tot sæcula extiterat, nondum factus erat? Factus quidem jam fuerat ille homo Abraham: sed nondum factum erat id, quod nomen ipsius significabat, et propter quod ei nomen illud a Deo impositum fuerat. Nondum gentes multæ fidem fuerant adeptæ; et propterea homo ille Abraham, qui pater fidentium est, nondum pater multarum gentium factus fuerat (Rom. iv. 11): nec porro Abraham ipsum vere factum esse adhuc dici poterat; cum Abraham nihil aliud sit quam Pater Multitudinis, id est, multarum gentium." Socin., Resp. Prior ad Paræn. Andr. Volani; Op., tom. ii. p. 379. b. See also Id., Unig.

Filii Dei Existent. inter Erasm. Johan. et F. S. Disput.; *ibid.*, p. 505. a: and Slichtingius, Comment. ad Joh. viii. 58; tom. i. p. 74. a: and Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. V. c. xiii. p. 486.

<sup>e</sup> "Erat nimirum Messias et ante Abrahamum, et ante mundum conditum, apud Deum. Nam quæ a Deo destinata et constituta sunt, antequam rebus et factis ipsis exhibeantur, apud Deum esse dicuntur." Slichtingius, Comment. ad Joh. viii. 58; tom. i. p. 73. b.—"Valde est elegans . . . interpretatio, ut dixerit Christus, 'Amen, Amen, dico vobis, priusquam Abraham pater multarum gentium fiat' (id enim vox Abraham significat), 'Ego sum,' Messias scilicet Ille a Deo promissus et a vobis expectatus." Id., *ibid.*, p. 74. a.



## CHAPTER XIV.

THE NAME OF GOD NOT ASCRIBED TO CHRIST FOR THE LIKE REASON AS TO CREATURES. THE REASONS WHY THE SOCINIANS WORSHIP CHRIST AS GOD DO CONFUTE THEIR LIMITATIONS. CHRIST NOT GOD BY VIRTUE OF HIS RISING AGAIN. HE IS "THE GREAT GOD," WITH ST. PAUL; "THE TRUE GOD," WITH ST. JOHN; "THE ONLY LORD," WITH ST. JUDE. OTHER SCRIPTURES. OF "THE FORM OF GOD," AND "OF A SERVANT," IN ST. PAUL.

BUT the Apostle adds still more and goes forwards, saying, "And the Word was God." Though here the Socinians think they have enough to plead, when they can say, that the name of "God" which is here used, is not proper to signify God Himself: which the name of four letters יהוה so signifieth in the Old Testament, that it is never attributed to any creature but by abuse; that is to say, as employed to express the sense of such men as believe not in the true God alone, but attribute His honour to some of His creatures<sup>f</sup>. For it is very well known, and granted on all hands<sup>g</sup>, that the name אלהים, which the Greek θεός here translateth, is attributed first to God's angels, then to God's ministers in governing His people. The reason whereof I take to be this, that, having entered into covenant with God to have Him for their sovereign and to live by His laws, they must needs be bound to acknowledge and to honour those who had commission from Him, whether immediately or mediately, to govern His people by the said laws, instead of God Himself; as deputies, commissioners, or ambassadors, represent the

[Scripture  
use of the  
terms יהוה  
and  
אלהים]

<sup>f</sup> "Ponit autem hic" (Joh. i. 1) "vocem Dei sine articulo emphatico, ut significet Sermonem" (τὸν Λόγον) "haudquaquam unum Illum Deum esse, . . . sed Deum prædicative (ut loquuntur) dictum, qui ab uno Illo Deo factus sit Elohim, id est, Deus. . . Sunt enim multi Dii (Elohim), iique veri, prædicative sic dicti, licet unus tantum sit Deus κατ' ἐξοχήν." Slichtingius, Comment., in Joh. i. 1; tom. i. p. 5. a, b.—So also Socinus, Explic. Cap. Imi Joh.; Op., tom. i. p. 79. b.—"Intelligi satis potest, verbum hoc" (Jehovah) "originis quidem ac nativæ significationis ratione commune esse: veruntamen tum ob ἐξοχήν significationis Dei evasisse proprium; tum ob

id, quod de aliis sive personis sive rebus in se spectatis nominis instar usurpatum nunquam fuerit, quin etiam in nativa sua significatione usurpari desierit. Observatum nihilominus fuit a viris doctissimis, id nomen, ut et cætera Dei propria, angelis tribui, Ipsius personam aliqua ratione sustentibus, idque absolute ac sine ulla positum adjectione." Crell., De Deo; ap. Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. I. c. xi. p. 79.—See Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii.; vol. ii. note g. pp. 138—140. ed. Burton, Oxon. 1833.

<sup>g</sup> See Pearson, *ibid.*, Art. i.; vol. i. p. 34: and for the Socinians, Crellius, De Deo; ap. Volkel., De Vera Relig.; lib. I. c. ix. p. 71.

BOOK  
II.

persons of those sovereigns from whom they come. This, I suppose, is a general reason, why this name of God in the Old Testament is communicated to the governors of God's people: which the Socinians cannot with any reason refuse. Neither can I imagine, how it should be more evidently justified than by that of God to Moses, *Exod. vii. 1*; "Behold I have made thee Pharaoh's God, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet<sup>h</sup>." For Aaron is made Moses his "prophet," to publish his orders to Pharaoh, because he was a man of a ready tongue, which Moses was not; *Exod. iv. 14—16*: "prophet" being no more than interpreter, or "truchman," as Onkelus translates it<sup>i</sup>. And therefore Moses is called also here 'Aaron's God,' because he was to give the orders which Aaron was to publish; but "Pharaoh's God," as ruler and prince over Pharaoh (who was ruler and prince of all Egypt) as to those things which God should by him command Pharaoh to do.

The name of God not ascribed to Christ for the like reason as to creatures.

§ 2. I suppose then, that we cannot come to a more peremptory issue with the Socinians, than by putting to trial, whether this name of God be attributed to our Lord Christ, to signify such a quality as is incompatible to a creature; nor that be more peremptorily tried, than by evidencing what is the honour and esteem, which the name of God importeth in our Lord Christ, and in God's creatures. For seeing that honour inwardly is nothing else but the esteem which a reasonable creature beareth in mind of that which it honoureth, seeing honour outwardly is nothing else but the sign of that esteem<sup>j</sup>; and seeing the distance between the nature of God and that of the creature is so unvaluable, that it is impossible that he who believeth that there is that which deserveth the name of God, should ever imagine that there is more than one: it<sup>95</sup> must remain no less impossible, that whosoever takes God for God, should ever take any creature of never so great eminence for the same. Indeed, that inward honour which I found in the esteem of the mind, is a thing of a finite and

<sup>h</sup> "Sic Moses constitutus fuit Deus super Pharaonem; sic pro Deo quoque Aharoni datus." Socin., *Explic. Cap. Imi Joh.*; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 79. b.

<sup>i</sup> כַּתְּוִיבִינֶהּ, interprets tuus: the original Hebrew being נְבִיאָהּ, pro-

pheta tuus. See Buxtorf, *Lex. Hebr. Chald.*, sub voce תְּוִיבִינֶהּ.

<sup>j</sup> "Seeing honour outwardly . . . esteem"—Corrected from MS. "Outwardly, the signs of that esteem," in original text.



moderate nature, whether it represent God or His creature; the understanding, in which it is, not being capable of any thing that is not proportionable to it: which notwithstanding, nothing hinders a finite conceit in the mind of a creature to represent an infinite perfection in that which it representeth, if any true conceit of God can be found in any of His understanding creatures.

§ 3. It is then manifest, that (I say not among the Socinians, but) among those who, upon misunderstanding the grounds of reformation, have fallen away from the most holy faith of the Church concerning the ever-blessed Trinity, there hath fallen a difference whether our Lord Christ is to be worshipped as God or not; Socinus being now in appearance the head of that party which would have it so<sup>k</sup>. And therefore I shall not much need to dispute that, but only for satisfaction of the reader repeat some of those texts of Scripture which they seem to have stopped the mouths of their adversaries with<sup>k</sup>. For when the Apostle saith, Heb. i. 6, "When He bringeth His only-begotten Son into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him;" supposeth he not, that men should do that which angels by God's authority do? And our Lord discourses, John v. 22, 23, that God hath given the power of judging to the Son, "that all may honour the Son as the Father; he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent Him." And this is that "will of God," the knowledge whereof moves angels and men to fall down before the Lamb that was slain, and give Him honour and glory<sup>l</sup>; Apoc. v. 8—13. Nor can any Christian deny, that He was worshipped in any other sense or quality, either by the blind man whom He had restored to sight (John ix. 38), or by others, whom we find to be accepted of Him, as those who had been well instructed of Him and by Him in that which they owed Him. Luke xvii. 5; "Lord, increase our faith." Mark ix. 24; "Lord, uphold my unbelief." Matt. xx. 30; "Have mercy upon us, O Lord

C H A P.  
XIV.

[It is disputed between Socinus and other Antitrinitarians, whether Christ ought to be worshipped as God.]

<sup>k</sup> "It is disputed in Volkel." (added in margin in MS.); who maintains the affirmative in the same qualified way as Socinus himself. See Volkel., *Instit. de Vera Relig.*, lib. iv. cc. x., xi.; lib. v. cc. xxix., xxx.: pp. 219 sq., 613 sq.; and for the references to Socinus, above, c. i. § 9. note x.

<sup>l</sup> "Hæ Divinæ voluntatis significatione commoti tum Angeli, tum homines, venerabundi coram Agno, Qui occisus fuerat, procubuisse, Etique gloriam ac honorem tribuisse dicuntur (Apoc. v. 8—13)." Volkel., *De Vera Religi*.  
221.

**BOOK II.** Thou Son of David." Luke xvii. 13; "Jesu Master, have mercy upon us." And, [Matt. viii. 25;] "Lord, save us, we perish." Therefore our Lord saith to the angel of Laodicea (Apoc. iii. 18), "I advise thee to buy of Me gold tried from the fire." For what should he buy it with, but the worship of God by prayers? And the Apostle, Heb. iv. 15, 16; "We have not an High-Priest that cannot compassionate our infirmities, but Who was tempted in all things like us without sin; let us therefore go to the throne of His grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace for help in time." Again, St. Paul, Rom. x. 12, 13; "The same Lord is rich to all that call on Him, for whoso shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." For that the worship of the only true God goes with the name of the Lord, ascribed to the Lord Jesus in the New Testament, no question can be made. So saith St. Luke of the first of martyrs, Acts vii. 59, 60; "And they stoned Stephen, praying and saying, Lord Jesu, receive my spirit:" and, "kneeling he cried with a loud voice, saying, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Every Christian can tell by what he does, Whom Stephen calls Lord. And that is enough to shew how ridiculous they make themselves, who, when St. Stephen says, "*Κύριε Ἰησοῦ*," would have it understood that he calls upon the 'Lord of Jesus,' not upon the "Lord Jesus<sup>m</sup>." For when St. Stephen offers to Christ the same prayer which Christ had offered to the Father, and David to God (Luke xxiii. 46, Psalm xxxi. 5<sup>n</sup>); is it not the same honour, whereof God alone is capable? For they that should say, that St. Stephen prayed this, not because all Christians are to pray so, but because he saw our Lord Christ at the right hand of God<sup>o</sup>; should make that, which would have been idolatry

<sup>m</sup> "Neque enim est quod quis dicat, Stephanum" (Act. vii. 59) "invocasse Deum, Quem Dominum Jesu appellaverit. Nam profecto, si ista mens Stephani fuisset, . . . non *Κύριε Ἰησοῦ* sed *Κύριε τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* scripsisset Lucas." Socin., De Jesu Christi Invoc. Disput. cum F. David; Op., tom. ii. p. 713. a.—"Vocem Jesu a Luca in gignendi casu usurpari, perindeque esse aiunt, ac si hunc in modum Stephanus locutus fuisset, Tu Qui es Dominus Jesu. Hoc vero falsissimum esse inde constat," &c. (giving the same reason as Socinus just quoted). Volkel., De

Vera Relig., lib. IV. c. xi. p. 225.—So also Wolzogenius, Comment., in Act. vii. 59; Op., tom. ii. p. 52.

<sup>n</sup> "Primo loco dicunt, istam precandi formulam" (Act. vii. 59) "ab Ipso Christo divinisque vatibus non nisi ad Deum Patrem directam fuisse (Luc. xxiii. 46, Ps. xxxi. 5)." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. IV. c. xi. p. 225.

<sup>o</sup> "Verum . . . dabunt fortassis, Stephanum Filio Dei preces istas adhibuisse; nequaquam tamen hoc ipsius factum, propter conditionis diversitatem, omnibus nobis pro communi exemplo atque regula esse debere con-



otherwise, to become acceptable service to God upon an accident depending on the free will of God. And what else did St. Paul, when he said, 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9: "Therefore besought I God thrice, that it might depart from me; but He said to me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for My power is effectual through weakness: most willingly therefore will I glory in my weakness, that the power of God may dwell in me." And St. John, when he prays, "Come Lord Jesus" (Apoc. xxii. 20), prays to Him Whose coming he desires, that is, Whose "strength is effectual through weakness." And whom else prays St. Paul to, when he says (1 Thess. iii. 11), "But God Who is our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, prosper our journey to you:" and (2 Thess. ii. 16, 17), "Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and God our Father, Who hath loved us, and given everlasting comfort and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and strengthen you in every good word and work." For there being here no difference between the worship tendered to God and to Christ, I must needs infer, that it is the same which St. Paul signifies, when he entitles his Epistle to all that call upon the name of the common Lord; 1 Cor. i. 2.

§ 4. It is true, they that allege all these arguments, do likewise caution, that this worship, and these prayers, which are tendered to God absolutely, are tendered to Christ with limitation of some certain circumstances; which being supposed it becomes due to Christ, being always due to God<sup>p</sup>. But if the difference between God and His creature be not acknowledged, it is impossible Christianity should stand. If

The reasons why the Socinians worship Christ as God, do confute their limitations.

tendent. Nam et vidisse tunc eum a dextris Dei stantem; et eandem ob causam singulare quiddam illi contigisse affirmant, quorum simile nihil hodie nobis accidat." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. IV. c. xi. p. 226: proceeding to answer the objection much as Thorndike does.

¶ "Hinc perspicuum est, nostram de Christi imploratione sententiam dubius assertionibus contineri. Quarum prior est, nos jure invocare Christum semper posse. Altera non semper nos ad id faciendum astringi. Ac prioris quidem assertionis nostræ indubitata veritas," &c. . . . "Sed jam sententiæ nostræ partem a (Dei Patris invocatio) c

nobis omnino sit, efficitur, eam a nobis prætermitti salva religione nunquam posse. Tametsi enim sæpissime precationis nostræ verba ad Christum citra expressam Patris mentionem convertuntur: tamen cum Christum, Qui Patri subordinatus est, invocando, Ipsum Patrem invocemus, tunc quoque mandatum illud exequi merito dici possumus. . . . Breviter, ea animi inductio ac persuasio quod Christum invocare liceat, simpliciter est ad salutem necessaria; ipse vero invocandi actus non simpliciter; sed . . . secundum quid, et veluti ex consequenti." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. IV. c. xi. pp. 221, 222.

<sup>p</sup>1. Socinus (as before quoted) assertion in a similar way.

BOOK  
II.

the difference between the worship due to God and to His creature be not acknowledged, it is impossible the difference between God and His creature should stand; because worship is nothing else but the acknowledgment of this difference. Therefore, where the worship of God is tendered to His creature, either the creature is made an idol or truly supposed to be God. Therefore our Lord argues, that the Father, judging no man Himself, hath given the power of judging to the Son, "that all may honour the Son as they honour the Father, because he that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father" (John v. 22, 23): to wit, since the settling of Christianity.

Christ not  
God by  
virtue of  
His rising  
again.

§ 5. Whereby we may see, how easy it is to answer the objection that is made<sup>a</sup> from the words of St. Peter, Acts ii. 36; "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this Jesus, Whom ye crucified, Lord and Christ:" as if this honour and worship were due to our Lord Christ upon the title of being raised from the dead by God; and so much signified by St. Paul, when he tells the Jews of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 33), "that God hath fulfilled the promise made to the fathers, to them and their children, raising up Jesus; as it is written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.'" For when the Apostle argues, that "Christ is become so much superior to the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name; because to whom of the angels was it ever said, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee'" (Heb. i. 4, 5); it is pretended, that (not the title of Son of God, which at present I speak not of, but) the honour and worship due to Him that wears it, is due by God's raising Him from the dead to the estate of sitting at His right hand<sup>r</sup>. Than which nothing can be more un-

[Ps. ii. 7.]

<sup>a</sup> "Non negamus igitur Jesum singularem Dei Filium . . esse, . . sed quid hoc ad essentialem illam ex omni æternitate generationem? Cum . . res sit ejusmodi, quæ tum demum perfecta fuit cum Eum Deus a mortuis excitatum ad dextram Suam collocavit. Tunc enim, ut in Actis (ii. 36) testatur Petrus, Deus Ipsum fecit Dominum ac Christum." Volkell, De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xii. p. 476.—"Adde quod resurrectio Christi cum Ejusdem gloria, quæ consecuta est, tanto vinculo con-

juncta est, ut divini autores illius nomine, non ipsum tantummodo, sed simul etiam ea quæ illam consecuta fuere, immortalitatem quidem creberime, sed sæpe etiam regnum Ipsius complectuntur." Id., *ibid.*, lib. iii. c. xix. p. 101.—And see above, cc. i. § 9. note y, and x. § 5. note m.

<sup>r</sup> "Hi enim (Paulus, Act. xiii. 33, et Autor Epist. ad Hebr. i. 5.) ista Davidis verba (Ps. ii. 7) tunc reïsa completa fuisse ostendunt, quod Deus Jesum a mortuis excitatum



just. For as it is truly said by our Lord after His rising again (Matt. xxviii. 18), "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth;" so it is no less truly said (Matt. xi. 27), "All things are delivered to Me by My Father; neither knoweth any man the Son but the Father, nor knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and whomsoever the Son will reveal Him to." And therefore, not disputing at present what the power given the Son by the Father is, it shall be enough for my purpose, that it is the same which was given Him when He rose from the dead; to wit, that which all Christians acknowledge, when they worship Him for God. For how should any man understand, that the man Jesus, by being raised from the dead, by being taken up into heaven to the throne of God, by any thing that His human nature can be endued with, should be worshipped for God, had not this worship been due to Him from the time of His being man; as I have shewed you those who make this objection do acknowledge it to have been due\*? For it is our Lord's argument, that the Son is to be honoured as the Father, because His Father hath given Him the power of raising the dead to life, and of judging the quick and the dead (John v. 25—27); even then when He argued with the Jews.

§ 6. Therefore, when St. Thomas, being satisfied that our Lord was risen from the dead, cries out, "My Lord and my 97 God," John xx. 28; there can be no more cause to understand any abatement in the notion of "God," or "Lord," than

He is  
["God,"  
without  
any abate-  
ment in  
the notion,  
to St.  
Thomas.]

mortalitateque donatum ad regii pontificii muneris perpetuam dignitatem extulit. Atque hoc fuit illud gignere." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xii. p. 474. So also Socinus, Resp. Prior ad Paræn. Andr. Volani; Op., tom. ii. p. 381. b: Defens. Animadvers. adv. Gab. Eutrop., c. viii.; ibid., p. 671. a.

\* "Angeli . . coram Agno . . procubuisse dicuntur. Nec mirum: quandoquidem hunc Illi honorem tunc etiam aliqua ex parte habitum fuisse constat, cum in tam excelsum summæ dignitatis atque imperii gradum nondum ascendisset. Cujus rei exempla non pauca apud Evangelistas obvia sunt, quibus sane non civili tantummodo sed plane divino honoris cultu  
libet non os-  
bit. Erat

enim jam revera, pro temporis illius ratione, et Christus, et in forma Dei constitutus." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. iv. c. x. p. 221. And see above, § 3.

† "Quod si vim aliquam habere" (articulum in verbis S. Thomæ Joh. xx. 28) "concedendum sit; consentaneum est, Thomam, cum Christum a Deo resuscitatum videret, dicere voluisse, Eum esse illum Dominum Qui a Deo fuerit Israelitico populo promissus," &c.; "ut jure Eum non modo Dominum Suum sed et Deum Suum appellare possit aut debeat. . . Quare articulus potissimum censendus erit ἀναφορικὸς, qui mentem ad rem certam anteaque notam referat." Crellius, De Deo: in Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. i. c. xiii. p. 101.—So also Socinus, Ad F. David, Epist.; Op., tom. i. pp. 395, 396: who

BOOK II. when David, or our Saviour upon the cross, cries out "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Ps. xxii. 1.

[Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.] For if David, or St. Thomas, were such men as believed those to be God which were not, it would be necessary to say, that their God is not absolutely God. But supposing them to acknowledge the true God, we cannot deny Him to be the true God, Whom they so acknowledge.

[The "Blessed God," with St. Paul.] § 7. In the words of St. Paul, Rom. ix. 5,—“Of whom is Christ according to the flesh, Who is over all, God blessed for evermore,”—there is some pretence made, that Erasmus<sup>a</sup> finds not the word “God” alleged by St. Hilary and St. Cyprian. And Grotius<sup>b</sup>, I know not upon what mistake, hath said, that it is not in the Syriac: for he that shall read the Syriac, will find it there, as plain as any thing else that is there<sup>c</sup>. And supposing it not there, he that considereth what the Jews (with whom St. Paul having been bred, never fell from their God) understand by “the blessed,” will never

agrees with Crellius in allowing the words to be directly applied to our Lord Himself.

<sup>a</sup> “Sanctus Cyprianus (Adv. Judæos, lib. ii. c. v.) adducit hunc locum omissa Dei mentione. Itidem Hilarius enarrans Psalmum CXXII. Quod incuria librorum esse omisum videri potest. Etiam Chrysostomus nullam dat significationem se hoc loco legisse Deus: quæ vox poterat adjecta videri a studioso quopiam, velut exponente, quis esset Ille super omnia, nempe Deus. Nec est quod hic vociferemur Christum spoliari Divinitate, quum idem dicat periphrasis quod nomen Dei.” Erasmus, ad Rom. ix. 5.—“Interea agnoscere oportebit vocem ‘Deus’ in Spirensi, veteri innominato, Remboldi, et Erasmi editionibus abesse: sed in sequentibus habetur, atque etiam in omnibus MSS. quos consului. Quamobrem defectus iste jure merito ab Erasmo librariis imputatur.” Fell, ad S. Cypr. Adv. Jud., lib. ii. c. vi.; Op., p. 35: who accordingly prints it in the text.—The word occurs also in the Benedictine text of St. Hilary (S. Hilar. Pictav., Tract. in CXXII. Psalm., § 7; Op., p. 393. E. ed. Bened.). “Incuria scribarum omisum ibi, patet ex contextu Hilariano.” Mill ad Rom. ix. 5.—“Καὶ λογισμὸς πῶς ὁ Θεὸς μετὰ τοῦ Παιδὸς ἐποίησατο τὴν σπουδὴν σῶσαι αὐτοὺς, ἀνεβόησε μέγα, καὶ εἶπεν, Ὅς ἐστὶν εὐλο-

γητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν· τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχαριστίαν ἀναφέροντες αὐτὸς τῷ Μονογενεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ.” S. Chrysa., In Epist. ad Rom. Hom. xvi. § 3; Op., tom. ix. p. 607. D. ed. Bened. “Chrysa. certe alibi non solum legebat Θεὸς et quidem non infrequenter, . . sed etiam ex hoc commate probat nomen Dei promiscue Patri et Filio convenire.” Mill ad Rom. ix. 5.—Socinus (Resp. Prior ad Paræn. Andr. Vol., Op. tom. ii. p. 377. b; and Resp. ad Vujek., ibid., p. 581. b) prefers to answer the passage (with Erasmus) by changing the punctuation, and so referring the words to God the Father.—“Hæc vox (Θεὸς) quibusdam in codicibus, ut in Syriaco et aliis, non legitur.” Slichtingius, ad loc.; Comment., tom. i. p. 254. a.—But see Mill ad loc.: and Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii.; vol. ii. note a. pp. 152—154.

<sup>b</sup> “Ex Syro apparet veteres codices habuisse δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ πάντων εὐλογητός,” κατ.λ.; “quod consuetæ locutioni Pauli melius convenit, qui cum de Patre et Filio loquitur, Patri nomen Dei, Filio nomen Domini tribuere solet. Et sic fuisse in vetustis codicibus Cypriani, sic etiam legisse Hilarium, nec aliter videri legisse Chrysostomum, notavit Erasmus.” Grot. ad Rom. ix. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Ap. Walton., Bibl. Sacr. Polyglot., tom. v. p. 658.

<sup>d</sup> See Pearson, On the Cræ vol. ii. note d. p. 155.



understand Him to be called any thing less than God, that is called "blessed for evermore." CHAP.  
XIV.

§ 8. Now when St. John saith (1 John v. 20), "We are in the true God, in His Son Jesus Christ, This is the true God and eternal life;" when St. Paul saith (Titus ii. 13), "Expecting the blessed hope and glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" when St. Jude saith of the heretics whom he writeth against, "Denying that only Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Jude 4): it is stoutly insisted upon by the Socinians, that God and Christ are spoken of here as several persons; and so, that these attributes, belonging to God, concern not Christ<sup>a</sup>. And examples are brought to shew, that it is not unusual, and therefore not unreasonable, that, in the words of St. John, "This He is the true God," should have reference, not to the Son Jesus Christ, mentioned next afore, but to the true God, Which is the Father, mentioned at more distance<sup>a</sup>: that in the words of St. Paul and St. Jude, though the article is not repeated, when they say, "*Τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος*"—"Τὸν μόνον δεσπότην Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρα," not τοῦ Σωτήρος—τὸν Σωτῆρα, yet this does not argue the same Christ to be meant by both titles referred to Him by the same article; but is only a bare want of the article in the second place, of which they give us examples enow<sup>b</sup>. But all this can prove

"The Great God," with St. Paul;  
"the True God," with St. John;  
"the Only Lord God," with St. Jude.

["καὶ  
Κύριον."  
Jude 4.]

<sup>a</sup> "Facile patebit, verba illa, 'Hic est verus Deus et vita æterna,' non ad Christum sed ad Deum Patrem referenda esse." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. p. 424.—"Locus enim Pauli (Tit. ii. 13), ex quo nominis istius (Magni Dei) probatio peti solet, non Christum sed Ipsius Patrem respicit." Id., ibid., p. 425.—"Quod autem Christus 'solus herus Deus' dici putatur (Jude 4), a vero alienissimum est: cum vel sola verborum concinnitas istam opinionem prorsus convellat. . . Cur non potius Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum ab illo solo Vero Deo hoc loco distingui, et sic Christum illum solum Verum Deum minime esse statuimus?" Id., ibid., pp. 426, 427.—So also Slichtingius, ad Tit. ii. 13, et 1 Joh. v. 20; Comment., tom. ii. pp. 286, a, 417, b, 418, a: and Socin.,

<sup>b</sup> Vujek., ad 1 Joh. v. 20; Op., 7. b, 588, a.

<sup>a</sup> "Neque vero est, quod quis omnino necesse esse dicat, ut pronomen Hic ad proxime nominatum Filium Dei referatur: quandoquidem relativa sæpenumero non id, quod proxime antecesserat, sed id potius, quod rei caput est, seu de quo potissimum agitur, respiciunt, quamvis fuerit remotius. Sic enim, verbi causa, apud Paulum 2 Thess. ii. 9," &c. Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. pp. 424, 425: proceeding to cite other instances also.—So also Slichtingius, ad loc.; Comment., tom. ii. pp. 417, b, 418, a.—And see below, c. xvii. § 3.

<sup>b</sup> "Dicent, non conjungi hoc loco diversa, sed unam eandemque personam diversis nominibus describi: quandoquidem Servatoris et Magni Dei nomen uno tantum articulo regatur: articuli autem unitatem rei ipsius quoque unitatem indicare. Verum istam de uno articulo regulam perpetuam

BOOK II. no more, than that these texts might be so understood, if there were any thing in the words to argue that so they must be understood; which here appears not. On the other side, for the text of St. Jude, if we compare it with St. Peter (who writes the same things with St. Jude, of the same heretics), we shall find, that in the beginning of the chapter, instead of the words quoted out of St. Jude, he puts only, that "they deny the Lord" or "the Master that bought them;" in the end of it, he signifies manifestly, that he speaks of Christians that fell away; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 20—22: whereby it may appear, that it is our Lord Christ Jesus, Whom he calleth "the only Lord" or "Master," because He redeemed us from the state of captives; and therefore that it is the same, Whom he calleth God. And truly, as I shewed afore<sup>c</sup>, that St. John in his Epistle to the seven Churches in the Revelations writes against the same heretics, so can there no question be made, that they are the same, of whom he says, 1 John ii. 22, 23, "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? this is the Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son; whosoever denieth the Son, neither hath the Father:" though we suppose this Epistle to be written to the then Christian Jews. For whereas they all pretend to hold God the Father, Whom, as Jews originally, they acknowledge; the Apostle argues, that bringing in another Christ, not the Son of God Who made the world, they could not rightly say, that they held God the Father. So that his argument, being proper against them, demonstrates who they are. And this is the reason of that which went afore: "And ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things; I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth:" and of that which immediately follows; "Let that therefore which ye have learned from the beginning remain in you; if that remain in you which ye have heard from the beginning, ye also shall remain in the Son and in the Father." For because they knew what faith they had embraced when they became

[1 John ii.  
20, 21.]

[1 John ii.  
24.]

minime esse, hinc satis constat, quod apud Matth. xxi. 12," &c. "Plura ejus rei exempla vide Matt. xvi. 1. 6,"

&c. &c. Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. p. 426.

<sup>c</sup> Above, c. xii. § 4.



Christians, no man need tell them, that they who would not have our Lord Jesus to be the Christ were liars; and the Holy Ghost, which good Christians receive upon the hearty profession of Christianity, he justly presumes, will maintain them in it. This for the text of St. Jude.

§ 9. But I say further, that the name of "the true God," "the great God," "the only God," which all of them attribute to God, is attributed to Him in equivalent terms; not only in those texts of the Old Testament (when the proper name of God is given to the angels that spake in the person of God), which I spoke of afore; but also in those, where the name, attributes, and actions<sup>d</sup>, of "the only true great God," are given to the Messias; which, we agree, is our Lord Jesus: and, therefore, that there can be no cause to bring unusual figures of speech to expound these texts, for fear they should say that, which is so many times said in the Scriptures.

§ 10. St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 10, 11: "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ," saith he; "for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, unto Me shall every knee bow, and every tongue give praise to God." Which, any man may see, is said of God by His prophet, Isai. xlv. 23. And therefore I marvel it should seem strange, that the same Person should be called "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus ii. 13): when the appearance there mentioned is not the appearance of the Father, but of Christ, Who shall appear Judge at the last day; though He have from the Father the glory wherein He shall appear.

§ 11. Again, when he saith, 1 Cor. ii. 8, "Had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory;" it is manifest, that he ascribes unto Christ the title of the only true and great God in Ps. xxiv. 7—10.

§ 12. So the Apostle, Heb. i. 10[—12], affirming that to be said of Christ, which we read Ps. cii. 25—27: "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thine hands; they shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be

CHAP.  
XIV.

Other  
Scriptures  
[also, ex-  
press the  
full mean-  
ing of these  
texts in  
equivalent  
terms.]

[Rom. xiv.  
10.]

[1 Cor. ii.  
8.]

[Heb. i.  
10—12.]

<sup>d</sup> Corrected from MS. "an action," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall never fail." For whereas they grant, that the end is of Christ, where he speaks of ending the world at His coming to judgment; but not the beginning, where he speaks of making the world, because there He is called by the proper name of God<sup>e</sup>: I call all the world to witness, what there is in the words to argue, that he speaks not still of the same person, of whom he began to speak. What will they not do to rack the Scriptures, and force them to say what they never meant, that are not ashamed to advance pretences in which there is so little appearance, rather than confess what all the Church of Christ maintaineth?

[Mal. iii.  
1.][“before  
Me.”]

§ 13. So, when the prophet says, Mal. iii. 1, “Behold I send My messenger, and he shall sweep the way before Thee, and suddenly shall the Lord, Whom ye seek, come to His temple:” it is so manifest, that he ascribes the title of the only true God to the Messiah, that Grotius, who is so much carried away with the Socinians’ exposition of divers texts in this point, could not forbear to say that the hypostatical union is signified by this<sup>f</sup>. And therefore it is manifest, what ‘Lordship’ we are to understand, where Zachary saith to the Baptist his son, “Thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways;” Luke i. 76.

[Ps. cx. 1.  
—Heb. i.  
13.]

§ 14. So, when the prophet David saith of the Messiah, Ps. cx. 1, “The Lord said to my Lord, sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool;” and the Apostle inferreth upon it, Heb. i. 13, “To which of the angels said He ever, Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?” he remits us for his meaning to that which he had premised there of Christ (Heb. i. 3), that, “having merited by Himself the cleansing of our sins, He sate down on the throne of majesty in the highest” heavens; and again, Heb. viii. 1, “We have such an High-priest, as is set down on the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heavens.” For the majesty of God being presented in the Scripture by that which is most glorious

<sup>e</sup> Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. pp. 449—451.  
<sup>f</sup> “Ante faciem Meam” dicit, quia in Messia vivit Deus multo plenius ac

perfectius quam in ullo pronhetarum.  
διὰ τὴν ἐνώσιν τὴν ὑπο-  
ριστον, ἀδιάλειπτον.”  
iii. 1.



upon earth, of a king upon his throne, as king of heaven and earth, whose commands all the angels stand about the throne ready to execute; to seat our Lord Christ upon the same throne is to commit the highest degree of treason against the majesty of God, by challenging for Him the honour due to God alone; if He be not the same God, on Whose behalf those words challenge it. Ask any Jew, that hath learned God from the Old Testament, what “כֶּסֶּא הַכְבוֹד” —“the throne of glory”—is, or rather, what He is that sits on it<sup>s</sup>; and see if he do not refuse our Lord Christ that privilege, because he must allow Him to be “the only true God,” if he do not.

§ 15. But why should I be troubled to fit Him with the title of “the only true God,” Who expressly challenges to be esteemed “equal to God?” John v. [18,] 21—23: “For as the Father raiseth and quickeneth the dead, so also doth the Son quicken whom He please: for neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all may honour the Son as they honour the Father; he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father That sent Him.” Which is as much as if He had said, he that honoureth not the Son as he honoureth the Father; having said afore, that “all may honour the Son, as they honour the Father.”

§ 16. As for that answer of His, John x. 33—36;—“The Jews answered Him, saying, For a good work we stone Thee not, but for blasphemy, and because Thou being man makest Thyself God: Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I have said ye are Gods? if he called them Gods, to whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be voided, tell you Him, Whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?”—where, they say, it is manifest, that He challengeth not the title of God properly, but as it is communicated to creatures, as here to the judges of Israel<sup>h</sup>: it is to be granted, that our Lord here employs that which St. Chrysostom often calls “οἰκονομίαν,” that is, ‘good hus-

<sup>a</sup> Rabbinos, . . . כֶּסֶּא הַכְבוֹד, sub voce כֶּסֶּא.

<sup>s</sup> Thronus majestatis <sup>h</sup> Crell., De Deo; in Volkcl., De Vera Relig., lib. i. c. xiii. pp. 94—96.

BOOK  
II.[John x.  
37, 38.]Of "the  
form of  
God," and  
"of a ser-  
vant," in  
St. Paul.  
["Thought  
it not rob-  
bery to be"  
—Eng.  
vers.]

bandry' or 'sparingness',<sup>1</sup> in His language<sup>k</sup>; expressing in more reserved terms, that which He intends not to renounce. For, seeing the Jews ready to stone Him for that which they understood by it, no marvel if He abated His plea without quitting it; arguing from the less,—If they to whom the Word of God came are called Gods, much more He that is sanctified and sent into the world by the Father, may call Himself so: and plead this reason too, without disclaiming the property of the title, because of that which immediately follows; "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not; but if I do them, though you believe not Me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe, that the Father is in Me, and I in Him." Where, it is plain, He holds up His claim by pleading the evidence of it.

§ 17. As for that of St. Paul, Phil. ii. 5—11: "Let the same mind be in you as in Christ Jesus; Who, being in the form of God, made it not an occasion of pride"<sup>l</sup> (or "of advantage"), "that He was equal with God; but emptied Himself, having taken the form of a servant, and become in the likeness of men: and being found in figure as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient to death, even the death of the cross: wherefore God also hath over-exalted Him, and given Him the name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, both of things in heaven, and upon the earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confess, that Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Here I admit (with Grotius<sup>m</sup>) the speech to be of

<sup>1</sup> "Κατ' οἰκονομίαν fieri aliquid dicitur cum aliud quidpiam specie-tenus geritur, quam quod vel intenditur vel revera subest. Hinc fit, ut quædam mali speciem præ se ferant, quæ tamen, cum alio fine aliaque ratione peragantur quam primo videri possit aspectu, omnino prorsus culpa carere censentur." Suicer, sub voce *οἰκονομία*: where, and under *οἰκονομικῶς*, the passages are given, principally from St. Chrysostom, which bear out this interpretation.

<sup>k</sup> "Christus quidem nunquam Se negat esse Deum, Dei Filium, imo non detractat hominum ad Se venientium adorationem, et non tamen exserte et aperte dicit Se esse Deum. Deus nempe, prout videbat decere sapien-

tiam Suam, apertam hujus Mysteriorum notitiam differebat ad resurrectionem usque Christi," &c. "Quare ex illa revelationis *οἰκονομίας* Christus non hic negat Se esse Deum verum." Cameron, ad Joh. x. 35: ap. Crit. Sac., tom. iv. p. 1722.

<sup>l</sup> "Sensus est, 'Non venditavit Christus, non jactavit istam potestatem: quin sæpe etiam imperavit ne quod fecerat vulgaretur.'" Grot., ad Philipp. ii. 6.

<sup>m</sup> Explaining "ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων," of Christ while upon earth:—"Μορφή . . . significat . . . id quod in oculis incurrit, qualis erat eximia in Christo potestas sanandi morbos omnes," &c.; "quæ vere divina sunt, ita ut Moses, qui tam magna non fecit



Christ incarnate,—that the Man Jesus is said to have emptied Himself, and taken the form of a slave, becoming obedient to death. For this Man it is, Who, when He so emptied Himself, was presently “in the form of God,” of which “He emptied Himself, thinking it no occasion of pride” (so I allow him to translate it, though some words of Eusebius<sup>n</sup> make me think it more properly translated “advantage”), “that He was equal to God;” but condescending so far to dissemble what He was, as to be crucified. But supposing this, I demand, how came Jesus to be in this “form of God,” before He humbled Himself; and wherein it consisted? For if they say, that in consideration of His undertaking the message of God (when, being thirty years old, He was taken up to heaven, as they say<sup>o</sup>) He was exalted to it<sup>p</sup>, then can they not say, that He was endowed with it from His birth, as being conceived by the Holy Ghost. But if, as St. Paul says, He was so, when He emptied Himself of it, then it is  
 100 to be demanded, by virtue of what He was so. For by virtue of being conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of a Virgin, according to them<sup>q</sup>, He will no more be so, than the first Adam, being formed of virgin earth, and the breath of God breathed in him. But if by virtue of the power and glory of God, that is, of God dwelling in Him, according to Grotius<sup>r</sup>, then by virtue of the hypostatical union; which afore, you saw<sup>s</sup>, he confesseth. But “the name above every name, at which all things in heaven and earth and under the earth bow,” importing the honour that is proper to God, which no man can give to any creature without making it God, though given to the Man Jesus, yet signifies the reason for which it is given to stand in the Godhead, that is communicated to His manhood; and that always due since He was man, though not declared to be due, nor published to the world,

dictus ob id fuerit ‘Deus Pharaonis.’”  
 Grot., ad Philipp. ii. 6. See Volkel.,  
 De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. pp. 436, 437.

<sup>n</sup> “Οἱ” (viz. οἱ μάρτυρες) “καὶ ἐπὶ  
 τοσοῦτον ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ  
 ἐγένοντο, ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων  
 οὐχ’ ἀπαγμὸν ἠγάσαστο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα  
 Θεῷ· ὥστε ἐν τοιαύτῃ δόξῃ ὑπάρχοντες,  
 καὶ οὐχ’ ἄπαξ οὐδὲ δις, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις  
 μαρτυροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς ἴσα  
 Θεῷ.”

ἐπέτρεπον τούτῳ τῷ ὀνόματι προσάγο-  
 ρεῖν αὐτούς.” Euseb., H. E., lib. v.  
 c. 2. p. 166. B.

<sup>o</sup> See above, c. xiii. § 9. notes x—z.  
<sup>p</sup> See above, § 5. notes q, r; and c. x.  
 § 5. note m.

<sup>q</sup> See above, c. i. § 9. note y; c. xiii.  
 § 9. note z.

<sup>r</sup> See above, note m.

<sup>s</sup> See above, § 13. note f; and c. xv.  
 § 12. note d.

**BOOK II.** while He was in it, till He was over-exalted to it upon His rising again, and the Holy Ghost sent to enable His Apostles to preach it.

## CHAPTER XV.

NOT ONLY THE CHURCH BUT THE WORLD WAS MADE BY CHRIST. THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH, IN OPPOSITION TO THE SPIRIT. HOW THE PROPHETS, HOW CHRISTIANS, BY RECEIVING THE WORD OF GOD, ARE POSSESSED BY HIS SPIRIT. HOW THE TITLE OF SON OF GOD IMPORTETH THE GODHEAD. HOW CHRIST IS THE BRIGHTNESS AND IMAGE OF GOD.

Not only the Church but the world was made by Christ.

[John i. 3.]

[Isa. lxxv. 17; lxxvi. 22; 2Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1.]

THIS is the next argument, which the next words of St. John point out to us; when he saith, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made." Which, because they are peremptory in this cause, so long as they are understood as all Christians have hitherto understood them (that the world was made by that Word of God which we believe to have been incarnate in our Lord Christ), Socinus hath played one of his masterpieces upon them, to persuade us to believe, that they mean no more, but that 'our Lord Christ is the author of the Gospel,' whereby Christians are, as it were, new made, and created a Church; seeing it is manifest, that the prophets do often describe the deliverances and restorings of God's people by comparing them to the making "of a new world, with a new sun and moon and stars, and all creatures new." But when they do so, it is first understood, that they speak as prophets; for whom it is

t "Vox igitur Omnia" (in Joh. i. 3) "non ita simpliciter intelligenda est, ut ad mundana hæc trahatur, sed ad negotium Evangelii jam tunc publicati atque recepti accommodari debet; quasi dicat Johannes, Omnia nova hæc spiritualia atque divina, quæ apud nos et in toto terrarum orbe facta conspiciuntur, .. non aliunde ortum habent quam a Jesu Christi Evangelii prædicatione, Christique opera et potestate sunt facta. . . . Appositissimum exemplum ex Sacris Litteris petitum adducemus. Hæc itaque apud Paulum verba invenies 2 Cor. v. 17: 'Si qua ergo in Christo, nova creatura est, vetera præterierunt, ecce nova facta sunt

omnia.' . . . Haud secus Evangelista noster dixit, omnia per Christum facta esse, non quidem cælum et terram et alia cuncta quæ prius creata fuerant. Quid enim hoc ad ejus institutum? Sed ea universa per Christum facta fuisse asserit, de quibus ipse scribere instituerat, Joh. xx. 30, xxi. 25; et præterea quidquid, ab ipso omissum, ad præsens negotium pertinebat. . . . Omnia hæc igitur per Christum sunt facta, et sine Ipso factum est nihil, quod ad hanc (ut ita dixerim) factionem pertineat." Socin., Explic. Imi Cap. Johan.; Op., tom. i. p. 80. b. So also Volkcl., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. x. p. 446.



proper to express things to come in figurative speeches, because it is not the intent of God's Spirit, that the particulars signified should be plain aforehand; that the dependance of God's people upon Him and His word may be free: then, by the consequence of the prophecies compared with the events, argument enough is to be had, that these speeches are not properly but figuratively meant. As for example, when the prophet Esay saith, "Behold I make a new heaven and a new earth;" in that very addition of "new," there is argument enough to conclude, that he speaks by a prophetic figure: which, if a man read on, he shall find still more to conclude. But had he said, 'Behold I make heaven and earth;' either we must understand 'make' for 'have made,' or that he means to make indeed such as these are: and that, supposing these destroyed; inasmuch as, these abiding, those that might be made, could not be called "heaven and earth," but *a* heaven, and *an* earth. Now, in these words, there is nothing added to intimate any abatement in the proper signification of "all things:" and therefore St. John, speaking in such terms as he that writeth dogmatically would be thought so to use as not to be mistaken, must needs be understood to mean, that the world was made at first by God's Word, Which by and by he will tell us that It was "incarnate." Especially, that we may not make him to spend words to tell Christians such a secret as this,—that Christ is the first author of the Gospel, and founder of His Church;—which they that believe not, might know, by seeing Christians spring from His doctrine.

- 101 § 2. Neither is that which follows any thing less clear; [John i. 10.] "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." Though Socinus hath used his skill to darken it, with a strange device of three senses of this one word "world," in this one sentence: which he conceives will be an "elegant" expression, if we understand the "world," when it is said, "He was in the world," to signify His new people; when it is said, "The world was made by Him," the Church, that is, all Christians; when it is said, "the world knew Him not," the unbelievers<sup>u</sup>. And truly, I believe, most

<sup>u</sup> "vocab

<sup>u</sup> terraque verba fieri statuendum est; idque propter vocis istius ambiguitatem,

BOOK  
II.

languages will justify the people among whom a man lives, to be called "the world." The ordinary French says, *Il y a beaucoup de monde dans ceste ville*—there is a great deal of world in this town; word for word. But that, in the two clauses following, the world should stand, first for believers, then for unbelievers, is such a figure, without any thing added to give occasion so to understand it, as nothing can be added to make it passable; though something might be added to make it to be understood. Besides, consider what follows; [John i. 11.] "He came to His own, and His own received Him not." For are the Jews "His own" people only because He was of that people? Are the Jews no otherwise "His own," than the English may be called mine own, because, being English, I bring that which here I have written to the English? Surely St. John meant to aggravate their fault more, than by charging them to have refused a countryman of their own; to wit, Him that had made them, and Whose they were upon that [John i. 9.] score. Consider what went before; "This is that true light that lighteth every man that comes into the world." For unless we understand this to be every man that comes into the Church (which will be to deny, that Christ gives any light to unbelievers, at least to be signified by these words,

utpote quæ, præter memoratam ejus significationem, jam hominum consociationem et quasi civitatem significat, jam homines sceleribus inquinatos, jam denique futuras illas nostras sedes ac beatissimam vivendi rationem quam 'mundum futurum' vocat D. Autor Epist. ad Hebr. Adeo ut nihil prohibeat, quominus Johannes hoc in loco (i. 10) de diversis mundis, non sine sermonis venustate, loqui credamus: ut nimirum Christum in hoc mundi domicilio fuisse, perque eundem futurum illud sæculum effectum esse, quo pacto etiam infra gratiam et veritatem per Christum factam esse asserit; homines vero perditos Eum nequaquam cognovisse ostendat. Si enim (ut adversarii volunt) duobus modis vocem mundi in his verbis accipit Joannes, nunc pro rerum aspectabilium universitate, nunc pro hominibus impiis; nulla est ratio, cur, cum ter hanc vocem repetierit, triplici eam significatione non usurparit. Imo hoc haud paulo est concinnius illo atque elegantius." Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. v. c. x. p.

447.—"Hic" (in Joh. i. 10) "mundum metonymice pro hujus mundi hominibus accipi, nulli dubium esse debet; id enim manifestissime apparet, dum inquit, 'Etmundus Eum non cognovit.' Nam de hominibus tantum hoc dici nemo inficias ibit." Socin., *Explic. Imi Cap. Johan.*; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 81. b. "Omnibus Evangelistæ nostri mens nota fit; ait enim, Christum in mundo fuisse, hoc est, inter homines versatum esse, et mundum per eum esse factum, id est, homines denuo quodammodo factos et creatos fuisse. . . . Et tamen, cum hoc Christus fecerit, totque beneficia in homines contulerit, ab illis cognitus non fuit; quin et a Judæis crucis supplicio affectus, Romano magistratu assentiente, et postea in membris Suis, tum a Judæis, tum a gentibus, acerrime insectatus et quotidie morti acerbissimæ datus fuit." *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 82. a. And so also, *Christ. Relig. Instit.*, *Refut. Arian. de Christi Essentia*; *ibid.*, p. 658. a.—See also Slichtingius, *ad Joh. i. 10*; *Comment.*, tom. i. pp. 9. a, b. 10. a.



and to make them import no more than the same great secret—that Christ is the author of Christians), we must understand by it (as the truth requires it to be understood), that our Lord came into the world because He came to live among that people, called the world; by that most ordinary figure of speech, that is called *κατὰ συνεκδοχήν*; that “the world” so properly called (and therefore all that it containeth, that is, “the world” *κατὰ συνεκδοχήν* so called, to wit, that people) was made by Him; and that nevertheless “this world,” being the body of that people, “knew Him not,” that is, owned Him not, being His own, as all people are whom He enlighteneth.

§ 3. And what means the Apostle, when he says of the Son, Heb. i. 2, 3, “Whom He made heir of all things, by Whom also He made the worlds:” and, “Who beareth” or “moveth all things with His powerful word.” For if any man attempt to apply the same salve to this wound also, what will he have these “worlds” to be, but those of which he saith again, Heb. xi. 3, “By faith we understand that the worlds were made by the word of God:” to wit, the world of invisible things, and this visible world, which by the Jews’ writings<sup>x</sup> we understand, that their ancestors were wont to call “this world,” and “the world to come,” because they expected to live in it after this: whereupon the same Apostle saith again, Heb. ii. 5, “For He hath not subjected the world to come to angels;” meaning the invisible world of angels, which to us is to come. As for that which followeth, whether He “sustain” or whether He “move all things by His word,” seeing it is His word that does it, the same is God’s Word That made all things, called His Word also, because incarnate. And what is it less for Him to “move all things,” than that which St. Paul saith of God, Acts xvii. 28, that “in Him we live, move, and have our being?”

§ 4. And St. Paul, Coloss. i. 16; “For in Him” (or rather “through Him”) “were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are on earth, visible things and invisible, whether dominions, or magistrates, or powers, all things were created by Him and to Him.” For what hath Christ done for the

[“and for  
him” Eng.  
vers.]

<sup>x</sup> See Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. on St. Matth. xii. 32*; *Works*, vol. ii. p. 190.

BOOK  
II.

angels, that He should be said to have "made" them? Suppose the redemption and reconciling of mankind make a new world with us, is the reconciling of the angels to us by reconciling of us to Himself, the 'making' of them, as it is the new making of us? Is the making of Him head of them the 'making' of them? If it be, it is not He that made them, seeing it is the Father that made Him head of them. But what shall become of "all visible things," besides man, <sup>102</sup> which are said here to have been created by Christ, and cannot be made anew? Therefore it is the whole world, that St. Paul means was first "made," not men and angels, that he means were restored, by Christ. And when he says they were made "by Him and to Him," that is, "for Him," he bars that snare, which some<sup>y</sup> put upon the Apostle's words [Heb. i. 2.] when he says, "By Whom also He made the worlds;" to wit, that he means, 'for Him He made the worlds:' according to a common saying among the Jews, which they think he points at, that "the world was made for the Messiah." I see that δι' ὃν signifies sometimes δι' οὗ, both serving to signify a mean, which belongs still to the effective cause. As when it is said, that all things subsist "διὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ," Apoc. iv. 11; that the martyrs overcome "διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἀρνίου, καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν," Apoc. xii. 11; that the false prophet deceives "διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι," Apoc. xiii. 14: it is all one whether we understand, "For the will of God—for the blood of the Lamb, and the word which they witness—for the signs which were granted him to do," or "by and through" the same; because both import a mean effective cause. But that δι' οὗ should signify δι' ὃν for the final cause, is that which no Greek will endure. And in this place St. Paul, having said that all things were made "δι' Αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς Αὐτόν"—"through Him, and to Him," that is, "for Him," leaves no room to understand any thing else by these words. But there is a

<sup>y</sup> "Videtur δι' οὗ [per quem] hic recte accipi posse pro δι' ὃν [propter quem]. Nam sicut διὰ cum accusativo interdum est per, ut alibi ostendimus, et amplius probatur per locum Apocal. iv. 2. xii. 11. xiii. 14; ita διὰ in genitivo interdum valet propter. Vide Bezam

Rom. vi. 4. Sic δι' ὧν pro quapropter poni solet. . . Ideo autem hæc interpretatio hoc loco maxime mihi se probat, quia ad Hebræos scribens videtur respicere ad dictum vetus Hebræorum, 'Propter Messiam conditum esse mundum.' Grot., ad Heb. i. 2.



further reason in the case and theme which St. Paul speaks to : whereby it is evident, that he challengeth 'the making of all things' to Christ, because he challengeth to Him that worship, which the heretics whom he writes against, tendered to angels, as those by whom the world was made (which I shewed before<sup>2</sup> was the doctrine of Simon Magus and Cerinthus, both in the Apostles' times); and inferreth the abstinence from God's creatures as proceeding from another principle, from which also Moses' Law came according to their doctrine<sup>3</sup>; the observation whereof they therefore pressed, not as Moses had delivered it, but as it was revealed to them by the said angels, from whom Tertullian saith<sup>a</sup> they pretended to have received those doctrines which they imposed upon the Colossians, though according to the Law of Moses. And this is the ground of those things which St. Paul discourses, as well against legal observations as against the worship of angels, Col. ii. 16—[23]; which, if you will survey what Grotius hath noted upon that place<sup>b</sup>, and upon 1 Tim. iv. 1—5<sup>b</sup>, you shall find to be directly opposed to the doctrines of those heresies; which had their beginning even during the Apostles' times. So that the reason why he saith, that "they hold not the Head, from Whom the whole body, furnished and compacted by joints and bands, groweth the growth of God" (Coloss. ii. 19), is because they would not

<sup>2</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 2, 5, 10.

<sup>a</sup> See above, c. xii. § 14. note c.

<sup>b</sup> "Una clausula comprehendit et Judaizantes et Pythagorizantes. Vino abstinere perpetuo non erat Judaicum nisi in paucis, apud Pythagoristas frequens. Cibis nonnullis Judæi abstinabant, multo pluribus Pythagoristæ. Illa de diebus Judaizantes spectant." Grot. ad Coloss. ii. 16.—"Habet speciem modestiæ non audere Deum accedere sed ad angelos preces deferre ad Deum defenderunt: quo colore philosophi defenderunt τὴν πολυθείαν. . . Ab Essenis diligenter custodita angelorum nomina ex Josepho discimus. Alioquin publicus Judæorum mos non fuit angelos compellare nisi eos qui ipsis apparebant, nimirum metu ne paulatim ad πολυθείαν relaberentur. . . Et quia hoc malum invaluerat in Phrygia, ideo Synodus Laodicensis vetat ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν." Id., ad Coloss. ii. 18.—"De-

ficient a Christiana fide multi philosophicis ratiunculis tentati. . . Munit Timotheum adversus ea quæ ipso adhuc vivente erant eventura. Patet id infra. (v) 6." Id., ad 1 Tim. iv. 1.—"Pythagoricos maxime indicat, quorum præcipui erant Magi et cum dæmonibus habebant commercium. Inter hos insignis fuit Apollonius Tyanaeus, qui hic eximie denotatur. Venit enim Ephesum vivente adhuc Timotheo." Id., ibid.—"Hæc est ἀποχὴ ἐμψύχων . . . observata Pythagoristis, de qua extat Porphyrii liber. . . Hæc duæ abstinentiæ a nuptiis et a ciborum parte potissima, sunt cornua velut agni, Apoc. xiii. 11. Christiani ista laudabant: sed non exigebant, ut videre est Canone Apostolico li. in Synodo Ancyrana et Gangrensi. . . Cum tam aperte hic denotentur Enekratitæ, nihil mirum si illi Pauli Enistolas non receperet, quod nos C<sup>onstantin.</sup> Id., ad 1 Tim. iv. 3.

BOOK  
II.

have the angels and the world to be His work; which therefore St. Paul must be understood to oppose. And truly, when they grant the passage of the Psalm noted by the Apostle, and repeated before<sup>c</sup>, Heb. i. 10, "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth," &c., to belong to Christ, where it speaketh of changing the world, but to God, where it speaks of making the world (there being no difference imaginable between the making and the changing of it); what reason can be imagined, why all, and the proper name of God with all, should not be said of Christ? Thus much at least our Lord not only says but argues, John v. 19 [—23]; that God hath given Him such works to do as Himself doth (to raise the dead, for example, and to judge both quick and dead), "that all men might honour Him, as they do the Father;" which is neither more nor less than to esteem Him neither more nor less. And in the place afore named<sup>d</sup>, resuming and reinferring His claim of being "equal to God," which (to divert the fury of the Jews) He had seemed a little to wave, John x. 37, 38; "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not; but if I do them, though ye believe not Me, believe the works; that you may know that My Father is in Me and I in Him." Where you may see, that by the miracles which our Saviour shewed them, having obliged them to believe that He was a prophet come from God, and by consequence that whatsoever He came to teach them is true; by the works which He foretold, of His sitting down at the right hand of God, sending the Holy Ghost, calling the Gentiles, raising the dead, and judging both quick and dead, He obligeth those that believe Him to be Christ, to believe Him to be God, being such things as none but God can do. 103

The Word  
was made  
flesh, in  
opposition  
to the  
Spirit.  
[John i.  
14.]

§ 5. Now when St. John says further, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we saw His glory as the glory of the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth;" it is not to be denied, that the name of "flesh" intimateth the weakness of that mean estate in the which it pleased Christ to come<sup>e</sup>: but that, implying this, it should

<sup>c</sup> Above, c. xiv. § 12.

<sup>d</sup> Above, c. xiv. § 16.

<sup>e</sup> "Ac primum quidem illis Joannis

Evangelistæ verbis contineri videtur"  
(scil. the doctrine of our Lord's H-  
manity), "'et Verbum Caro fi



not express His being man<sup>e</sup>, is a thing which the bare name of "flesh" will not endure; the people of God only being acquainted with spiritual and invisible substances, in opposition to which man being called "flesh" (or "flesh and blood"), the weakness of his nature must by consequence be implied, the nature itself being directly understood and expressed. Wherefore, when the Apostle saith, 1 John iv. 2, 3, "Every spirit that acknowledgeth Jesus Who is come in the flesh to be Christ, is of God; and every spirit that acknowledgeth not Jesus Christ that is come in the flesh to be Christ, is not of God;" it is manifest, that he speaks of those heresies, which would have the Christ to be something else than the Man Jesus, belonging to the "fulness of the Godhead:" whether it came upon the Man Jesus to leave Him again (according to Cerinthus<sup>f</sup> during the time of the Apostles, and Valentine<sup>g</sup> and others afterwards), or whether it never appeared in the person of a man in the world. For I have made it manifest before<sup>h</sup>, that these were the doctrines of those heresies, whereof he gives them warning. Besides, we must here recall all the reasons that have been used<sup>i</sup>, to shew, that St. John in the premises speaks of the state of the Word before the birth of our Lord, and not before His appearing to preach: by which it will appear, that we shall

CHAP.  
XV.

est.' Quod quidem nihil ad hanc rem facere primo inde apparet," &c. "Multo satius, et ad rem quam Joannes agit, accommodatius fuerit, si eo animo illum hæc verba fecisse intelligamus, ut Hunc, Cujus opera Deus hominibus voluntatis Suae perfectissimæ consilium primum patefecit, ac totum hominum genus reformare, et novam ei rerum ad religionem pertinentium faciem inducere instituit, hominem fuisse mortalem, infirmitatibus ac perpassionibus, mortis denique, obnoxium ostenderet." Volkcl., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xi. pp. 461, 462. So also *ibid.*, p. 465.—"Primum" (Johannes in i. 14) "hoc spectavit, ne, si quis ea quæ de Christo superius scripserat, legisset, nimirum quod sit Deus," &c. "et tamen vel ex aliis qui de Christo scripserant, vel ex notissima fama percepisset, vel etiam ipsemet vidisset, Christum fuisse hominem abjectum," &c., "prima fronte offenderetur. . . . Quocirca, postquam

deinde confessus est Eum fuisse carnem, hoc est, hominem imbecillum, ærumnosum, despectum, humilem, contemptum, et non secus atque alios morti obnoxium. Carnis enim nomine in Sacris Litteris hominis imbecillitatem atque humilitatem significari apertissime constat." Socin., Explic. Imi Cap. Joh.; Op., tom. i. p. 83. a.

<sup>a</sup> "At dicunt" (orthodoxi), . . . "Nos, commodiore explicatione adhibita, nihil aliud, Verbum Carnem factum esse, significare dicimus, quam Id in Virginis Mariæ utero carnem assumpsisse. Elegans sane interpretatio; sed undenam illam hauserunt? Quemnam locum huic similem, qui interpretationem istam patiatur, ex Sacris Litteris adducere poterunt?" Socin., Explic. Imi Cap. Joh.; Op., tom. i. p. 83. b.

<sup>f</sup> See above, c. xii. § 22.

<sup>g</sup> See above, c. xii. § 21.

<sup>h</sup> Above, c. xii. § 4.

<sup>i</sup> Above, c. xiii.

BOOK  
II.

not need to dispute with Socinus<sup>k</sup> about the signification of the word "*ἐγένετο*," whether it may at any time, or whether here it may, or must, signify "was," or "became;" the consequence of the text necessarily inferring, that when St. John says, "*ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*," his meaning is not, that this Word "was a mean man," but that the Word "became man," which it was not afore. And, therefore, for St. John's meaning, we must look to the opposition between the flesh and the spirit, so often expressed and signified to be in our Lord Christ by the Apostles. St. Paul, speaking of the fathers, Rom. ix. 5, "Of whom," saith he, "is Christ according to the flesh, Who is God blessed for evermore;" intimating, that He is another way "according to the Spirit." That way he expreseth, Rom. i. 3, [4]; saying, that Christ, Who "came of the seed of David according to the flesh, is declared" (or, as the Syriac translates it, "known to be") the Son of God according to the Spirit of holiness, by rising from the dead." Whereupon another Apostle says (1 Pet. iii. 18), that "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in" or "by the Spirit:" or, as St. Paul again, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, "Crucified out of weakness, but alive out of the power of God." For in all these speeches, as "the flesh," and the weakness thereof, signifies the manhood, so "the Spirit," the Godhead. For, in the Gospels, sometimes He professeth to do miracles and cast out devils by the "power of God," sometimes by the "Holy Ghost:" Mark vi. 5, ix. 39: Luke iv. 36, v. 17, vi. 19: where we hear, what "the sin against the Holy Ghost" in the Gospel is; namely, for those that stood so plentifully convict, that these works were done by the power of God in Him, to say, that they were done by the prince of devils. For when the Baptist saith (John iii. 34), "He Whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God, for God giveth Him not the Spirit by measure;" he maketh the difference plain enough between "the fulness of the Spirit" dwelling in Christ (which is the Godhead of the Word incar-

[Matt. xii.  
31; Mark  
iii. 29;  
Luke xii.  
10.]

<sup>k</sup> "Nemo autem qui Græcas literas vel a limine salutaverit, ignorat, hæc verba non minus 'Et Verbum Caro fuit,' quam 'Et Verbum Caro factum est,' et bene et proprie verti posse." Socin., Explic. Imi Cap. Joh.; Op.,

tom. i. p. 83. a: and Christ. Relig. Instit., Refut. Arian. de Christi Essentia; ibid., p. 663. a.—So also Volkell., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xi. p. 462.

<sup>l</sup> Apud Walton, Bibl. Sac. Polygl., tom. v. p. 636.



nate, never to be parted from the Manhood of Christ), and that measure of it by which the prophets spake, for the time that they were inspired. As St. Paul says of the Church, that grace is given it "according to the measure of Christ's gift;" Ephes. iv. 7. Wherefore the Apostle, having observed afore, that Melchisedec is called a priest, "not according to the commandment of a carnal law, but according to the virtue of indissoluble life," Heb. vii. 16, thus proceedeth, Heb. ix. 13, 14; "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkled, sanctify the polluted to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the everlasting Spirit offered Himself to God blameless, cleanse our consciences from dead works, to serve the living God?" For though the soul of Christ raised from the dead have immortality, which is "life indissoluble," yet it hath not "the virtue" of it; which is to be ascribed to the Spirit, Which raised Him from the dead as well as us: according to St. Paul, Rom. viii. 10, 11; "If Christ be in you, though the body be dead because of sin, yet the Spirit is life because of righteousness; but if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised Jesus from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies also, through His Spirit that dwelleth in you." And whether the cleansing of sin can be ascribed to any gift bestowed upon the human soul of Christ, as here they would have it ascribed to the immortality thereof<sup>m</sup>, let all the world judge. I deny not indeed, that Christ offers the sacrifice of Himself to the Father in the heaven of heavens; as the priest offered Him the blood of those sacrifices which were burnt without the camp, in the holy of holies: but if I should deny, that He offered Himself

[“law of  
a carnal  
command-  
ment.”]

<sup>m</sup> “Siquidem Eum” (Christum) “et innocentissimum esse voluit, et a morte, cui universum humanum genus prorsus obnoxium est, vindicavit, ac sempiterna vita donavit. Unde factum est, ut nos, immortalitatis spem concipientes, carne licet circumdati, non carni sed spiritui obtemperandi non voluntatem modo sed vires etiam adepti simus; et sic a peccati servitute liberati, justi coram Deo habeamur.” Socin., De Jesu Christo Servat., P. II. c. xxiii.; O-

179. a, b;

paraphrasing

in the same words, in his Explic. Locc. S. S.; Op., tom. i. p. 149. b.—“Per Christum Deus dum Eum similem peccatori facit, hoc est, dum Eum per passionibus et crucis supplicio subjicit, ex peccati servitute nos vindicavit; non solum quia ipsum peccatum in nobis delevit, sed etiam quia nullas vires, Christi resurrectione deinde consecuta, illi adversus nos reliquit.” Id., De Jesu Christo Serv., P. II. c. xxiii. p. 179. a.

<sup>n</sup> Corrected from MS. “that” in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

to God when He was crucified<sup>o</sup>, I might as well deny, that the priest[s] offered their<sup>p</sup> sacrifices to God, when they killed them at the altar, and burnt them upon it. So manifest, so certain it is, that "the eternal Spirit," by virtue whereof the blood of Christ being offered cleanseth sin, was in Christ before His rising again.

[The disputed text in 1 Tim. iii. 16.]

["seen of angels, preached to the Gentiles."]

§ 6. And this is that which St. Paul saith, 1 Tim. iii. 16: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, preached to the Gentiles, seen of angels, believed of the world, taken up into glory." It is said indeed<sup>q</sup>, that the Syriac<sup>r</sup>, the Vulgar Latin<sup>s</sup>, the Arabic<sup>t</sup>, and the commentaries under St. Ambrose his name<sup>u</sup>, all want "Θεός" here; and understand St. Paul to speak of the Gospel all the while: and that, the Gospel being said to be "preached," before it is said to be "taken up into glory," "ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ" must be no more than that it is exalted and glorified. As if the order of the words did enforce that which is first said

<sup>o</sup> "Ostenditur Christum revera Sacerdotem non fuisse ante Suum in cœlum ingressum, hacque in re legali pontifici esse dissimilem." Socin., De Jesu Christi Servatore, P. II. title to c. xxiii.; Op., tom. ii. p. 178. a.—"Si legalis pontifex, qui vere et perfecte sacerdos jam erat, non ante expiasse peccata populi dici poterat, quam in sanctuarium ingressus esset, quanto magis id de Christo ante Suum in cœlum ingressum (cœlum enim hac in re sanctuario illi respondere antea demonstratum fuit) dicendum est, cum ante ingressum istum sacerdos nondum esset consecratus. Cœpit quidem quodammodo hic in terris Christi sacerdotium, sicut et oblatio cœpit. Sed utrumque in cœlis absolutum fuit, quo pro nobis præcursor ingressus Jesus secundum ordinem Melchisedec in æternum pontifex est factus." Id., ibid., c. xxiii.; ibid., b.

<sup>p</sup> Corrected from MS. "therein," in orig. text.

<sup>q</sup> "Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem (Θεός ἐφανερώθη, 1 Tim. iii. 16) faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs, et Ambrosius, qui omnes legunt δ ἐφανερώθη. . . Sensus bonum facit illud δ ἐφανερώθη. Evangelium illud cœleste innotuit primum, non per angelos, sed per homines mortales, et quantum externa species ferebat, in-

firmos, Christum et Apostolos Ejus." Grot., ad 1 Tim. iii. 16.—"Primo enim vox 'Dei' nequaquam in omnibus Græcis codicibus habetur, sed ad mysterium pietatis proxime nominatum omnia ista referuntur: quemadmodum in Vulgata editione et Syriaca interpretatione videre est. . . Adde, quod ipsa horum verborum complexio istam adversariorum explicationem prorsus excludit: cum ante istam in gloria assumptionem, Deus gentibus prædicatus, Eique fides in mundo adjuncta fuisse dicatur; id quod, antequam Christus in cœlum ascenderet, nunquam factum fuisse, quis ignorat?" Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xi. pp. 462, 463. And so Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 55. b.—But see Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii.; vol. ii. note q. pp. 144—148.

<sup>r</sup> Apud Walton., Bibl. Sac. Polygl., tom. v. p. 326.

<sup>s</sup> "Sacramentum quod manifestatum est," 1 Tim. iii. 16. Vulg.

<sup>t</sup> This is incorrect. The word is in the Arabic version (ap. Walton., Bibl. S. Polygl., tom. v. p. 827). It is wanting in the Æthiopic (ibid., p. 826).

<sup>u</sup> "Mysterium—quod declaratum est." Pseudo-Ambros., in 1 Tim. iii. 16; in Append. ad Op. S. Ambros., p. 296. B. ed. Bened.



to have been first done; or as if 'ἀνάληψις Μώσεως' or 'Χριστοῦ' did not signify 'the taking of Him up to God,' but the making of the Gospel famous. Such violence will a prejudicate supposition offer even to God's words, rather than to quit an argument. For to what sense can the Gospel be said to be "manifested in the flesh," because preached by the Man Christ? And suppose it may be said to be "justified by the Spirit" (as "wisdom is justified by the children of wisdom," Matt. xi. 19, Luke vii. 35), how much more proper is it to understand, that God, Who "appeared in the flesh," should be said to be "justified" so to be "in" or "by the Spirit," the works whereof shewed Him so to be; as afore?

§ 7. Neither shall we need to make any greater doubt of the reading of those words of St. Paul, Acts xx. 28; "Look therefore to yourselves, and to the whole flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of God which He hath gotten with His blood:" though the written copy at St. James[s]<sup>x</sup>, and the Syriac<sup>y</sup>, read here "Χριστός," instead of "Θεός." Because, that 'the Church over which the Holy Ghost makes bishops,' is 'bought with the blood of Christ,' is the same with that of the Apostle afore, that "the blood of Christ offered by the eternal Spirit cleanseth" sin. CHAP. XV.  
[And Acts xx. 28.]

§ 8. Neither is it so easy to avoid the words of the Apostle, Heb. ii. 16, as some imagine<sup>z</sup>:—"For He took not angels, [Ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι<sup>y</sup> in Heb. ii. 16.]

<sup>x</sup> It does not appear from Mill (ad loc.), that any MS. whatever reads Χριστοῦ. Thorndike refers to the Codex Alexandrinus, sent to Charles I. by Cyril Lucar; where the reading is Κυρίου. Wetstein prefers Κυρίου; Mill retains Θεοῦ. And see Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii.; vol. ii. note r. p. 148.

<sup>y</sup> Apud Walton., Bibl. S. Polygl., tom. v. p. 600. ܠܚܝܣܬܐ.—"Videtur omnino Interpres iste (Syrus) . . . etiam hoc loco legisse quod alii complures, Κυρίου, sensum autem magis quam vocem ipsam insecutus, reddidisse; prout alibi." Mill ad Act. xx. 28.—"Dicimus, Nomen Deus (in Act. xx. 28) ad Christum minime referri debere, sed ad Ipsum Deum Patrem; Cujus dicitur is esse sanguis quem Christus effudit, ea figura sermonis et ob eam causam, propter quam dicitur auid prophetam

eum, qui tangit Dei populum, Ipsius Dei pupillam oculi tangere. . . Taceo quod in Syriaca editione pro 'Dei' legitur 'Christi.'" Socin., Resp. ad Vujek., c. vi.; Op., tom. ii. p. 600. a. And so Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 37.

<sup>z</sup> "Assumere semen Abrahæ ibidem (Heb. ii. 16) non denotat humanam naturam ad Divinam adjungere: quippe cum semen Abrahæ non humanam naturam sed Abrahæ progeniem, nunc carnalem nunc spirituale, significet. Hoc loco de spiritali sumi potest. . . Illos igitur Christum assumere, Autor D., et veluti manu porrecta apprehendere, suscipere, ac sublevare dicit. Id enim denotare solet verbum ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, cujus propria significatio est, suscipere vel apprehendere." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xi. p. 464.

BOOK  
II.[Heb. ii.  
15.]

but the seed of Abraham He took." Suppose "*ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*" be to "challenge," which is done by laying hands on that which we challenge<sup>a</sup>; is the ground therefore void, upon which He "challenges" those to life as His own, "that through fear of death were in bondage?" Does not the whole Epistle argue, that this is done by the offering of our flesh? Saith he not expressly, that "it behoved Him to become like His brethren in all things," and that "He is not ashamed to call them brethren," because "He that sanctifieth and those who are sanctified are all of one;" Heb. ii. 11, 14, 17? Does Christ vindicate mankind, or the seed of Abraham? For though this is written to the Hebrews alone, yet it was written at such time as all Christians understood that it belongs no less to the Gentiles. Wherefore it is manifest, that the word "*ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*" (which might seem to signify Christ's challenging mankind, or vindicating them, into freedom from death, as well here as elsewhere) is restrained by the text and consequence of the Apostle's discourse, to signify <sup>105</sup> the assuming of man's nature, by the means whereof He won mankind into freedom, and maintains it in the same.

How the prophets, how Christians, by receiving the Word of God, are possessed by His Spirit.

§ 9. In fine, when the Apostle saith, 1 Pet. i. 11, that "the ancient prophets did search, against what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ that was in them did declare and profess the sufferings to come upon Christ, and the glories following the same;" he sheweth plainly, that the same Spirit, by which they spake by fits, dwelt in the flesh of Christ for ever, having once assumed it: of which Spirit the Evangelist saith, Mark ii. 8, that Jesus "knew by the Spirit how the Pharisees reasoned of Him within themselves." For, as I said afore<sup>b</sup>, that when it is said in the Old Testament, that "the Word of God came" to this or that prophet, an angel appeared unto him, speaking in the person of God, who was therefore worshipped as God, because the Word of God (for Which, being incarnate, our Lord Jesus is for ever to be worshipped as God) was in that angel at the present for that service; so I must further note here, that upon such Word of God coming to a prophet he became inspired, that is, pos-

<sup>a</sup> "*Ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* apud Platonem et alios est 'solenniter vindicare.' Hic autem (Heb. ii. 16) ex superioribus intelligendum est 'vindicare' sive

'asserere in libertatem manu injecta.' " Grot. ad Heb. ii. 16: and see the last note.

<sup>b</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 3—6.



sessed and acted, by the Spirit of God, for the time of that service which God by such a message employed him about. CHAP.  
XV.  
Not that all prophets did receive such Word by such message from God, before they spake those things, which we believe still they spake by the Spirit of God. For there is a great deal of appearance in the Scripture for that which the Jews' doctors deliver unto us; Abarbanel<sup>c</sup> by name (alleging Maimoni<sup>d</sup> for his saying) upon Numb. xi.; that there are inferior degrees of prophecy, which came<sup>e</sup> not by apparitions, in which a man saw one that spake to him in God's name, but sometimes merely by inspiration of God's Spirit, inwardly moving either to act or to speak as God moved. So it is often said, that "the Spirit of God came upon, passed upon, invested," either judges or prophets; Judg. iii. 10, xi. 29, xiv. 6, 19; 1 Sam. x. 6, 10, [xi. 6]; Judg. vi. 34; 1 Chron. xii. 18; [2 Chron.] xxiv. 20: whereupon it is to be acknowledged, that those judges were also prophets; from Joshua the successor of Moses, to whom that promise of God (Deut. xviii. 18, [19,]) seems to belong in the first place. Nor is it therefore requisite that I dispute here, by what means these prophets were all assured, that it was God's Spirit, not an evil spirit, which moved them either to act or speak; much less, how they were enabled to assure others of it. Thus much we see in the case of Balaam [Numb. xxiii. 12, 26; xxiv. 12, 13.] (who by sacrifices to devils hoped to obtain of them a commission to curse God's people), that when he went to meet

<sup>c</sup> Isaac Abarbanel, פירוש התורה, seu Comment. in Legem, in Numb. xi.; fol. 289. b. fol. Venet. 1584: referring to Maimonides as in the next note.

<sup>d</sup> "Primus gradus Prophetiæ est, cum quis auxilio Divino ita instructus est et præditus ut eo moveatur et animetur ad magnum aliquod facinus perpetrandum, . . . illumque motum in se sentit et animadvertit. Hoc donum vocatur 'Spiritus Domini': et de homine virtute illa prædito dicitur, quod 'In illum irruerit Spiritus Domini' (1 Sam. x. 6), vel, 'Induerit eum Spiritus Domini' (Jud. vi. 34): aut, 'Quiescat super ipsum Spiritus Domini' (Jesai. xi. 2): aut, 'Fuit cum ipso Dominus': et similia alia. Et hic est gradus Judicium Israël omnium; de quibus in genere dicitur, 'Quum autem suscitasset Dominus eis Ju' . . . cum Judice, et ser' . . . hic

gradus etiam præstantissimorum consiliariorum Israël omnium, sicuti id speciatim in Regibus et Judicibus quibusdam declaratur: ut, 'Et fuit super Jephthachum Spiritus Domini' (Jud. xi. 29). Sic de Samsone: 'Et irruit in eum Spiritus Domini' (Jud. xiv. 19). De Saule: 'Et irruit Spiritus Dei in Saulem, cum audiret verba' (1 Sam. xi. 6). Ita de Amasa, cum incitasset eum Spiritus Sanctus ad suppetias Davidi ferendas; 'Et Spiritus induit Amasam,' &c. (1 Chron. xii. 18). Hac virtute quoque præditus fuit Moses inde ab eo tempore quo virilem ætatem assequutus est," &c. R. Moses Maimonides, More Nevochim, P. ii. c. xlv. De undecim distinctis Prophetiæ Gradibus; pp. 315, 316, as translated by the younger Buxtorf, 4to. Basil. 1629.

<sup>e</sup> Corrected from MS. "comes," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

his familiars to that purpose, and was met with by God, he knew God so well, and His message, that he durst not but do it. I shewed you afore<sup>f</sup>, that those angels by whom God spake to the prophets in the Old Testament, did not always speak in the person of God: and that in the New Testament, the Word of God having once assumed the flesh of Christ, though we read of divers apparitions of angels, yet we never read, that the angel who speaks in God's name is called God, or honoured as God. As for those prophets which we read of in the Churches under the Apostles, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29; xiv. 29, 32, 37; Ephes. iii. 5, iv. 11: as it is necessary to understand, that their graces were inferior to the graces of the Apostles, that it may be true which St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, "The spirits of the prophets, are subject to the prophets:" so can there be no reason to doubt, that they were of that inferior sort of prophets, that spake by the mere inspiration of God's Spirit, without apparition of any angel speaking to them, either asleep or awake, either in the name only, or further in the person also, of God. When therefore the angel Gabriel appeared to the blessed Virgin, saying (Luke i. 35), "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the most High shall overshadow thee; and therefore the Holy Thing that is born . . shall be called the Son of God:" we are to understand, that the Holy Ghost (Who, upon the word of God delivered to a prophet, possessed his soul for a time, till he had delivered God's word to them to whom it was sent), upon this message possessing the flesh of the blessed Virgin, made it a tabernacle for the Word of God always to dwell in; in which Word the Spirit of God always dwelt. For so the difference 106 holds between our Lord Christ, in Whom dwells "the fullness of His Spirit," and His servants, that have each of them his "measure" of it: if we understand the Word incarnate to have in It resident the power of God's Spirit, by which our Lord Christ proved Himself the Son of God (in particular, as St. Paul saith, "by rising from the dead by the Spirit of holiness"); but the servants of God, to whom this Word came, to be possessed and acted by the same Spirit, only while they were charged with the word of God, that is,

[John iii.  
34; Col. ii.  
9.]

[Rom. i.  
4.]

<sup>f</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 6, 7.



with their message. Neither seems it more difficult to understand, how Christians are possessed of God's Spirit by the general promise of the covenant of grace; when the assistance of God is, by God's appointment, assured them to all such purposes, as the common profession of Christianity requires.

§ 10. This is the reason of the alliance which the Scriptures express between the Word and Spirit of God in our Lord Christ: in regard whereof I have thought requisite to refer those Scriptures, which speak of the Spirit of God in our Lord Christ, to the grace of union, rather than to the grace of unction, as the school distinguisheth; that is to say, rather to the Godhead of the Word dwelling in the flesh of Christ (containing always and implying the Spirit), than to those graces parted out upon His soul; which I neither doubt of, nor that they are expressed in divers passages of the Scriptures. And this is the reason, why the very name of "the Spirit" is attributed to the Word Incarnate in divers passages of the most ancient Church writers; which Grotius hath carefully collected upon the foresaid text of Mark ii. 8<sup>h</sup>. And the position of Cerinthus is very remarkable: that, our Lord Jesus Christ being 'born as other men of Joseph and Mary, at His baptism, the Holy Ghost (that is, Christ),' saith he, 'came down upon Him in the shape of a dove, revealing the unknown Father to Him and to His followers; and that by this His power, coming upon Him from above, He did miracles: and that when He had suffered, that which came

CHAP.  
XV.

[How  
Christ is  
called the  
Spirit.]

\* "Though neither doubting that there are such habitual graces in Christ's human nature, nor that they are expressed in divers Scriptures." Added in margin in MS.

<sup>h</sup> "Τῷ Πνεύματι Αὐτοῦ"—'Spiritu Suo.' Non ut prophetæ, per afflatum, sed Suo Spiritu, id est, 'τῷ ἀκρᾷ μετοχῇ τοῦ Αὐτολόγου' (summa participatione verbi substantialis); ut Origenes adversus Celsum loquitur. Nam quod veteres Christiani, etiam Justinus, vocant Θεῶν φύσιν (Divinam naturam), is quem dixi Origenes 'Θείας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα καὶ χαρακτῆρα' (Divinæ naturæ effulgentiam et expressam formam), et 'Τὸ ἐν τῷ νοουμένῳ Ἀνθρώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Θεῶν, ὅπερ ἦν ὁ Μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ' (Quod in Homine illo Jesu Quem

intelligimus erat Divinum, id ipsum erat Unigenitus Dei Filius): idem solet et 'Spiritus' dici, ut 1 Pet. iii. 18." Grot., ad Marc. ii. 8: proceeding to quote Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Lactantius, the Hymn to Christ ascribed to Claudian, Prudentius.—"Vocatur ergo ἡ Θεῶν ἐν Χριστῷ φύσις (Divina in Christo Natura) Spiritus, non tantum διὰ τὸ ἀσώματον, . . quomodo Patri id nomen convenit, sed etiam quia quod ad distinctionem Verbi et Spiritus Sancti vocatur 'generare,' Græcis interdum et ἀπαιγάειν ('lucem de se edere'), id laxiori vocabulo etiam 'spirare' appellabant, qualemcunque emanationem aut (ut Tertullianus loquitur) προβολὴν ('protensionem') eo nomine indicantes." Id., ibid.

BOOK  
II.

from above flew up again from Jesus; so that Jesus suffered and rose again, but Christ that came upon Him from above, which is that which came down in the shape of a dove, flew up again without suffering; so that Jesus is not Christ<sup>1</sup>. For hereby, as it is manifest, that they hold with the Church, that Christ is God (assuring us thereby that it was the original faith of the Church), so they shew, that the overshadowing of the blessed Virgin by the Holy Ghost imports the incarnation of the Godhead to them who believe it; as the coming down of the Holy Ghost at the baptism, imports the dwelling of God's Spirit in Christ till His suffering, to Cerinthus<sup>k</sup>. And the same Epiphanius telleth<sup>l</sup> us of the Ebionites, that sometimes they contradict themselves. "Otherwhiles," saith he, "they say otherwise; that the Spirit of God, Which is Christ, came upon and invested the Man that is called Jesus<sup>m</sup>." I will give you here, if you please, that which goes before in Epiphanius. "Some of them say," saith he, "that Christ is that Adam, that was framed first, and inspired with the breath of God: others of them say, that He is from above, and was made before all things, being a Spirit" (or "the Spirit), and above the angels, and ruleth all things, and that He is called Christ, and hath inherited that world, and cometh hither when He pleaseth; as He came in Adam, and appeared to the patriarchs, putting on a body, coming to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: the same say, He came these last days, putting on the same body of Adam, and appeared a man, and was crucified, and rose, and ascended again<sup>n</sup>." Here you see, that, borrowing from the Scriptures the correspondence between the first and the second Adam, they force upon it their own fable, that both

[1 Cor. xv.  
45.]

<sup>1</sup> See the passage of Epiphanius, above, c. xii. § 22. notes t, u.

<sup>k</sup> See above, c. xii. § 22.

<sup>l</sup> Corrected from MS. "telling," orig. text.

<sup>m</sup> "Πάλιν δὲ ὅτε βούλονται, λέγουσιν, Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ εἰς Αὐτὸν ἦλθε τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅπερ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐνεδύσατο Αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καλούμενον." Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 30. § 3; Op., tom. i. p. 127. B.

<sup>n</sup> "Τινὲς γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ Ἀδὰμ τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι λέγουσιν, τὸν πρῶτον πλασθέντα τε καὶ ἐμφυσηθέντα ἀπὸ τῆς

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιπνοίας. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς λέγουσιν ἄνωθεν μὲν ὄντα πρὸ πάντων δὲ κτισθέντα πνεῦμα ὄντα, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγγέλους ὄντα, πάντων τε κυριεύοντα, καὶ Χριστὸν λέγεσθαι, τὸν ἐκείσε δὲ αἰῶνα κεκληρωσθαι ἔρχεσθαι δὲ ἐνταῦθα ὅτε βούλεται, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἦλθε, καὶ τοῖς Πατριάρχαις ἐφαίνετο ἐνδύμενος τὸ σῶμα· πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τε ἐλθὼν καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἦλθε, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἐνεδύσατο, καὶ ὥφθη ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἐσταυρώθη, καὶ ἀνέστη, καὶ ἀνῆλθε. Πάλιν δέ," κ.τ.λ. Id., ibid.,



was one. You see also by the same reason, that their relation of Christ's appearing to the patriarchs (as in our flesh afterwards), though corrupted by them, is nevertheless borrowed from the tradition of the Church. In fine, you see, that the rule of all things, the inheritance of the world, and the principality of angels, and the Spirit that is called Christ, here mentioned, argues, that the faith of the Church, which they corrupted by denying these attributes to the Man Jesus, attributed the same things to Him; which they denying, were therefore excluded out of the Church.

CHAP.  
XV.

§ 11. When St. John proceedeth, saying "We saw His glory as the glory of the only-begotten Son of" God; he refers to that which went afore,—“He dwelt among us.” Now, seeing it is so ordinary for the Jews to call the majesty of God dwelling among men שכינה<sup>o</sup>, which is the very word that St. John uses, “ἐσκήνωσεν;” we are obliged thereby to understand, that the majesty of God, dwelling among us in the tabernacle of Christ's flesh “bodily” (as figuratively it had done in the tabernacle or temple of the Jews), declared itself notwithstanding by those glorious works which it wrought in His flesh, to be what it was. For the title of “Son of God” is given in the Old Testament to the angels first; and to the Messiah, when David saith, Psalm lxxxix. 27, “I will make Him My first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.” Whereby it is evident, that this title in the literal sense belonged first to David: of whom also, he that will maintain the difference between the literal and the spiritual sense upon that ground which I settled before<sup>p</sup>, must maintain those

How the title of the Son of God importeth the God-head.

[John i. 14.]

[Gen. vi. 2; Job i. 6, ii. 1; xxxviii. 7.]

<sup>o</sup> “It is visible, that . . . St. John hath affected the term of ‘ἐσκήνωσεν,’ chap. i. ver. 14, when he speaks of the Λόγος; supposing, that the Λόγος or Memra, and the Shekinah, are the same. And this is acknowledged by the Jews, who maintain that the Memra, so many times spoken of in their Targums, is the Jehovah, the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel Redeemer whom Jacob invoked Gen. xlviii. 16; this very Ruler of Israel, to whom they refer all things related in the books of Moses. . . And such an expression of St. John is the more to be remarked, because he manifestly looks upon the words of Jesus

“the Jews, John chap. v. [v. 38],

“the Word of God dwelling

“Athanasius hath well

judged to be understood of the Λόγος or the Shechinah, not of the doctrine of the Law, as many interpreters would have it to be understood.” Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch. against Unitarians, c. xxi. p. 267. 2nd edition, Oxf. 1821.—“שכינה, Habitatio. In specie dicitur de præsentia, gloria, et majestate Divina aut Divinitate, quando dicitur hominibus esse præsens.” Buxtorf., Lex. Heb. Chald., sub voce. “Hoc sensu usurpat Johannes Græcum σκηνή in Apoc. xxi. 3; quando ait, . . . ‘Ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνή τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ σκηνώσκει μετ’ αὐτῶν.’” Id., ibid., in fin.

<sup>p</sup> Above, c. iii. § 4, 5; and see c. xvi. § 1 sq.

BOOK  
II.

words of David (Psalm ii. 7), "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," to be said. Now I suppose, that those who expected the Messias to come as a temporal prince, to deliver the people of Israel from the yoke of their oppressors into the free use of that law which they had received from God (as did not only the rest of the world, when Christ came, but even His own disciples, before His rising again), could by no means be informed of that spiritual kingdom, which by the "dwelling of the Word in our flesh" was intended to be raised. Which if it be true, though they called the Messias "the Son of God" as well as "the Son of David," yet is it impossible, that they should conceive the same ground for which He is so called, and by consequence understand the title in the same sense, as we do. And this difference of signification is necessary, even in the understanding of the Gospel. For when the centurion saith, at our Lord's death, Mark xv. 39, "Of a truth this Man was the Son of God;" it is not reasonable to imagine, that he who dreamed not at all of His rising again, but was a mere heathen, should call Him "the Son of God" in that sense which we believe: but either as heathenism allowed 'sons of the gods,' as some<sup>a</sup> think; or as, by conversing with the Jews, they had understood them to hold the Messias whom they expected, to be "the Son of God," as a prince raised by God<sup>r</sup>. What shall we say then of the Apostle's demand, "Unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee?" When we find the title of "sons of God," in the Old Testament, attributed to angels, surely it is

[Heb. i. 5;  
Ps. ii. 7.]

[Gen. vi.  
2; Job  
i. 6; ii. 1;  
xxxviii. 7.]

<sup>a</sup> "Cum Romani fuerint qui hoc dicebant" (scil. "Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ Ὑἱὸς ᾔνυστος"), "puto eos de Jesu ita existimasse quomodo de Hercule, Baccho, Castoribus, Æsculapio, Quirino, existimabant; et maxime ad celebrem de Quirino fabulam respexisse eos credibile est, circa cujus mortem et tenebræ et fragor contigisse dicebantur." Grot., ad Matt. xxvii. 54.

<sup>r</sup> "'Truly this was the Son of God.' That is, 'This was indeed the Messias.' Howsoever the Jews deny the Son of God in that sense in which we own it, that is, as the Second Person in the Holy Trinity; yet they acknowledged the Messias for the Son of God (not

indeed by nature, but by adoption and deputation; see Matt. xxvi. 63), from those places, 1 Chron. xvii. 13, Psalm ii. 12, lxxxix. 26, 27, and such like. The centurion had learnt this from the people, by conversing among them; and seeing the miracles which accompanied the death of Christ, acknowledged Him to be the Messias, of Whom he had heard so many and great things spoken by the Jews... Such are those words of Nathanael, Joh. i. 49, 'Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel.' " Light-foot, Hor. Heb., on Matt. xxvii. 54; Works, vol. ii. pp. 269, 270.



necessary to have recourse to that sense, in the which it was then known that Christians attributed this title to our Lord; still known by the honour, which then and now the Church tendereth Him according to it. For what will all that Socius acknowledgeth\*, avail to make good the Apostle's assumption; when he says that our Lord is the Son of God, because conceived without man by the Holy Ghost in the womb of a virgin? Is this any more than Adam may challenge, for which he is called "the son of God," Luke iii. 38? For the effective cause entereth not into the nature of that which it produceth. Neither importeth it any thing to the state of our Lord, that He was conceived of the Holy Ghost; if we suppose nothing in Him but a soul and a body, which those that are born of man and woman have. How then is the title of "the son of God" incompatible to the angels, which Adam thus far challenges? If you look back upon the premises, there remains no doubt, nor any way to escape it otherwise. The Holy Ghost, overshadowing the blessed Virgin, not only works the conception of a Son, but dwells for ever, according to the fulness of the Godhead, in the Manhood so conceived;

\* "Dico igitur, Christum merito dici posse Dei Filium naturalem, quia natus est Dei Filius, tametsi ex Ipsa Dei Substantia non fuerit generatus. . . . At vero Dei opera et virtus, in Christo homine in Mariæ Virginis utero formando, seminis viri vel potius viri ipsius vicem supplavit; . . . et propterea Christus homo merito a Deo in utero Sux Matris generatus dicitur." Socin., Resp. ad Vujek., c. v.; Op., tom. ii. pp. 569. b, 570. a.—"Nec vero 'Unigeniti' appellatio efficere potest, ut . . . credamus Filium Dei Unigenitum ex Ipsius Dei Substantia genitum esse: . . . idque tribus potissimum de causis. Una causa est, quod ex ipsis Sacris Literis edocemur 'unigeniti' appellationem aliud significare posse quam Filiationem quandam . . . omnino solam. Scimus enim Isaacum," &c. "Altera causa est, quod expressum in ipsis Sacris Literis habemus, cur Jesus Christus Dei Filius appellatur, nempe unicus et singularis ille Dei Filius. Ea vero est duplex; altera videlicet quæ ad Ejus ortum et nativitatem pertinet, altera quæ Ejusdem dignitatem et personæ quam sustinet excellentiam respicit. . . . Priorem causam expressit

Ipsius Dei Angelus Gabriel, inquit, Ipsi Virgini mox Jesu Christi futuræ Matri, Luc. i. 35, 'Spiritus Sanctus superveniet te,' &c. "Vides modum conceptionis et primæ existentie illius Hominis Jesu Nazarenæ; nempe, quod Spiritus Sanctus et virtus Altissimi illam sit operata, et sic Patris generantis loco Deus fuerit, causam esse, ut Ipse Homo Jesus Nazarenus, Qui Christus est, Dei Filius appelletur, et quidem consequenter singularis sive unicus et Unigenitus Dei Filius: quandoquidem nemo alius unquam talem a Deo sui ipsius originem et generationem habuit. Posteriorem expriment loca illa, ex quibus apparet, unicum illum et singularem Dei Filium idem esse quod Christum. Nam Christus præcipue ac potissimum regem populi Dei significat. Vides hic rursus Hominis Illius Jesu Nazarenæ summam post Deum dignitatem," &c., "causam esse, cur sit Ille unicus et singularis Dei Filius." Id., Lib. quod Homines Regni Polon., &c., c. iv.; ibid., tom. i. p. 699. a.—So also Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xii. pp. 475, sq.—See Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii.; vol. ii. note z. pp. 164, 165

BOOK as, by the nature of the Godhead, planted in the Word, Which  
 II. then came to dwell in the Manhood so conceived. Therefore  
 [Luke i. 35.] "that Holy Thing, which is born of" the Virgin, being "called  
 [Heb. i. 4.] the Son of God," is made so much above the angels, as the  
 esteem which this name imports is above any thing that is  
 attributed to them in the Scriptures. Therefore is this Son  
 of God honoured as God during His being upon earth, by  
 them that were instructed to understand the effect of it;<sup>108</sup>  
 though they that were not disciples, but took it only for a  
 title of the Messias, which they knew He pretended to be,  
 perhaps conceived not so much by it. Therefore our Lord  
 Himself poses the Pharisees, how they would have David to  
 understand the Messias to be his Lord, whom they knew to  
 be his Son: Matt. xxii. 42—45; Mark xii. 35—37; Luke xx.  
 41—44.

[The "ful-  
 ness of the  
 God-  
 head."]  
 [“Πεπλη-  
 ρωμένοι”  
 —“com-  
 plete.”  
 Col. ii. 10.  
 Eng. vers.] § 12. This is then that which St. Paul saith, Coloss. i. 19,  
 “For in Him it pleased God that all the fulness should  
 dwell:” and Coloss. ii. 9, 10, “For in Him dwelleth all the  
 fulness of the Godhead bodily;” and, “Ye are filled through  
 Him:” speaking of Christ. I shewed you before<sup>t</sup>, that the  
 heresies of that time, some whereof it is manifest were then  
 seducing the Colossians, did all agree in preaching God the  
 Father of all things to be unknown, together with all that  
 belonged to the completing of the Godhead, till they made  
 Him known. And all this contrived by the devil to subvert  
 the faith of Christ, by counterfeiting something like it in  
 sound; like false coin, to cozen the simple with. Whereas  
 therefore St. Paul here saith, that “the fulness of the God-  
 head dwelleth bodily in Christ;” and our Lord so often in  
 St. John’s Gospel, that “the Father dwelleth in Him, and  
 He in the Father;” and the fulness of the Holy Ghost dwell-  
 eth in the Word incarnate, as I shewed even now: it is mani-  
 fest, that they laboured to introduce a counterfeit “fulness  
 of the Godhead,” of their own devising<sup>u</sup>, into that esteem  
 and worship, which “the fulness of the Godhead,” contained  
 in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, preached by our Lord  
 Christ and His Apostles, challengeth: and, therefore, that  
 “the fulness of the Godhead” challenged by St. Paul to dwell

<sup>t</sup> Above, c. xii. § 2, 10.

<sup>u</sup> See above, c. xii. § 15—21.



in the flesh of Christ, must stand in opposition to that fulness which these sects worshipped; being challenged by St. Paul, as vindicating the Christian faith from that corruption wherewith these sects pretended to adulterate it; and being challenged by those sects (in opposition to St. Paul and the Christian faith which he vindicateth), to rest in those whom they severally preached, not in the Son and Holy Ghost together with the Father, as he maintaineth. For when "the fulness of the Godhead" is said to "dwell bodily" in the Son, it is to be understood, that the Holy Ghost also dwells in Him without measure; Which with the Father makes up that "fulness" that St. Paul understands, in opposition to those which the heresies preached. For, as it is plain that the Valentinians worshipped their thirty "Æones" or intellectual worlds<sup>†</sup>, so it is certain that the rest of their sects worshipped that "fulness" which they preached. Nay, those that held the world to be made by angels, that fell away from the "fulness," worshipped also those angels<sup>\*</sup> (which the Christians call devils); as the heathen did, and all magicians do, as all ages witness. This also is the reason, why St. Paul saith further, that "the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in Christ bodily:" because in the temple and sanctuary, and ark of the covenant, and sacrifices and ceremonies of that people (all pledges of God's presence), it is certain to Christians, that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt; as the body in the shadow, equally correspondent to it<sup>‡</sup>. For so I shewed you afore<sup>§</sup>, that the ark of the covenant, which in the twenty-fourth Psalm is called "the Lord of glory," is by the Apostle said to be our Lord Christ. But this reason is employed by St. Paul to make opposition against them, who pretended the Law to be given by those angels; the worship of whom, together with the observation of the Law (or at least of such precepts thereof as they might pretend the said angels to have revealed to them), they undertook to revive, that by this counterfeit Christianity they might avoid that persecution, which the Jews, out of hatred for the Law, brought upon true Christians. I shall now shew the fulness of the Godhead which dwelt figure

[Ps. xxiv.  
7—10.]

<sup>†</sup> See above, c. xii. § 21.

<sup>\*</sup> See above, c. xii. § 10, 11

BOOK  
II.[Col. ii. 10,  
11.][John i.  
14:—  
"Only-be-  
gotten of  
the Fa-  
ther."][John i.  
16, 17:—  
"grace and  
truth."]

nant, as now "bodily" in the flesh of Christ; then were not those angels authors of the Law, nor the observations thereof to be renewed together with the worship of those angels. And therefore it is not to be omitted, that when St. Paul adds, "And ye are filled through Him, Who is the head of all principality and power; through Whom ye are also circumcised with that circumcision which is done without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, through the circumcision of Christ;" he withdraweth them from the observations of the Law, by declaring, that the intent of them is fulfilled in good Christians from the fulness of the Spirit, that is, of the Godhead, that dwelt in Christ. Which is that which St. John intendeth, when he saith, that "we saw His glory, as of the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth;" that is to say, of that grace which contained the truth of those figures and shadows: as it followeth by and by, "Of His fulness we all have received, and grace for grace; because the Law was given by Moses, but grace and peace came by Jesus Christ." For the grace of the Gospel of Christ, as it comes instead of the grace of Moses' law, so are both<sup>a</sup> from the fulness of Christ; which, as I said afore<sup>b</sup>, was resident for the time in that angel that delivered the Law to Moses in God's name. In fine, so manifest are those words, that Grotius himself (who otherwise in expounding this epistle hath warped to the Socinians<sup>c</sup>) could not forbear to avow the "bodily dwelling" of "the fulness of the Godhead" in Christ, to signify that which the Church calls the hypostatical union of the Natures<sup>d</sup>. Here I argue, that when St. Paul saith,

<sup>a</sup> Corrected from errata and MS.; which read either "so both," or "are both," or "so are both."—"law, and both," in orig. text.

<sup>b</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 3—6.

<sup>c</sup> E. g. "Πρωτόκοκός πάσης κτίσεως, . . primus in creatione, nova scilicet." Grot., ad Coloss. i. 15.—"Ὅτι ἐν Αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα: . . certum est 'per Verbum creata omnia;' sed quæ præcedunt, ostendunt hic de Christo agi, quod hominis est nomen: quomodo etiam Chrysostomus hunc accepit locum: sed ille intelligit mundum creatum propter Christum, sensu non malo: sed propter id quod præcessit, rectius est ἐκτίσθη hic interpretari, 'ordinata sunt, novum quendam sta-

tum sunt consecuta.'" Id., ad Coloss. i. 16.—"Τὰ πάντα δι' Αὐτοῦ ἔκτισται, . . τὰ πάντα intellige omnia quæ ad novam creationem pertinent." Id., ibid.—Compare Slichtingius, ad Coloss. i. 16; tom. ii. p. 180. a, b.

<sup>d</sup> "Πάν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι—'omnem plenitudinem inhabitare;' nempe τῆς Θεότητος, Divinitatis (quod hic interpretandi causa addunt quidam Latini codices), id est, Divinarum virtutum, ut infra ii. 9. Sic πλήρωμα . . habemus et Joh. i. 16. . . Et nota κατοικῆσαι, 'inhabitare,' id est, 'perpetuo et inseparabiliter adesse;' non per tempora, ut in prophetis. Hæc est ὑποστατικὴ ἑνωσις (unio substantialis)." Grot., ad Coloss. i. 19.—"Optime



Phil. ii. 6, 7, that our Lord, 'being in the form of God, CHAP. emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave;' this "empti-  
XV.  
ness," which He took, is directly opposed by St. Paul to that "fulness of the Godhead," which He had, and dissembled by the "emptiness" of that state which He assumed.

§ 13. For here it is much to be observed, that as St. Paul [How the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father.] affirmeth the "fulness of the Godhead" to "dwell bodily" in Christ, because the Holy Ghost is understood always to be resident in the Word Incarnate; so, by the same reason, the Father also is contained in the Son, as the Son in the Father likewise: God the Father being so called in the New Testament (where the Son is revealed) in respect of the Son, Who revealed it, and Whom it revealeth. And that in opposition to that "fulness," from which each of the aforesaid sects pretended the revelation of the Father, otherwise unknown. It is not therefore to be doubted, that our Lord, when He says, as many times in the Gospel He does; (John x. 38) "For My works' sake believe, that the Father is in Me and I in Him;" (xiv. 7—11) "If ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also; and henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him; Philip saith unto Him, Lord shew us the Father and it shall suffice us; Jesus saith to him, So long am I with you, and knowest thou not Me? Philip, he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou, shew us the Father? believest thou not, that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? the words that I speak to you, I speak not of Myself, but the Father that abideth in Me, He doth the works; believe Me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; if not, believe Me for the very works' sake:—"I say, it must not, it cannot, be doubted, that our Lord means by these words; not that He said nothing, did nothing, but by

hunc locum" (Coloss. ii. 9) "intellexit Augustinus, cum scripsisset, 'In Ipso inhabitat plenitudo Divinitatis corporaliter, quia in Templo habitaverat umbraliter.' Sic infra v. 17 opponuntur σκιά (umbra) et σῶμα (corpus)." Id., ad Coloss. ii. 9.—"Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν" (Joh. i. 16), "verum usum ostendit vocis πληρώματος, . . . non ut (secundum Gnosticos) spatium aliquod supercæleste significet, sed ut τὴν ἀκρὴν μετοχὴν τῆς Θεότητος (summam Deita-

tis participationem), ut Origenes loquitur: ut et Coloss. i. 19, ii. 9. Clemens, Strom. ii.; 'Πᾶσαι δὲ αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Πνεύματος συλλήβδην μὲν ἐν τῷ πράγματι γινόμεναι συντελοῦσιν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τὴν ἑνότητα' (Omnes autem virtutes Divini Spiritus coadunatae atque in unam rem quasi conglutinatae simul omnes perficiunt Filium)." Id., ad Joh. i. 16.—See also the passages of the fathers collected in Suicer's Thesaur., sub voc. Σωματικῶς.

BOOK II. commission from God, which every prophet could say, so far as a prophet; (and the Jews need not to have taken up stones to throw at Him, when He said, John x. 30, "I and the Father are one;" had He meant no more, but that it was His Father's will which He declared :) but of necessity these sayings must import, that as the Word containeth the Holy Ghost, and is contained in It, so is the Son contained in the Father, and the Father in the Son, Who revealeth Him: as the Gnostics hereupon took occasion to pretend, that the unknown Father was contained in that "fulness," by which the several sects of them pretended that He was made known.

[The Only-begotten—the Light—the Truth.]

§ 14. And therefore, when St. John saith, that the glory of our Lord was "seen" to be "the glory of the only-begotten" Son of God; though it be granted, that the title of "only-begotten" implieth and insinuateth by way of "elegancy" "dearly beloved," because every "only" son is so<sup>e</sup> (as you may see it shewed by testimonies both of the Scriptures and other writers in Grotius<sup>f</sup>), yet, if this be the reason of that "elegancy" in the word, the ground of it therefore cannot be denied: and so the question will have recourse, why the only-begotten Son; and if not because conceived by the Holy Ghost, then, because "in Him dwelleth bodily the fulness of the God-head." To which sense the words of the Apostle, John i. 18, are very pertinent: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, That is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Hear Irenæus, ii. 7: "*Irrationale*<sup>110</sup> *est autem et impium adinvenire locum, in quo cessat et finem habet, Qui est secundum eos Propater et Proarche et omnium*

[“Propator”]

\* "Vox Unigeniti hoc loco" (Joh. i. 14) "non illud videtur significare quod vulgo creditur, Christum videlicet naturā Filium Dei esse, cum alii scilicet adoptione filii sint; sed potius (ut nos exposuimus) Illi acceptissimum esse et aliis dignitate præstantem. Vox enim Græca *μονογενής* . . . respondet Hebrææ *Jehid*; quæ eum de filio dicitur, unicum quidem significat, sed non tantum genitura, verum etiam dilectione, successione, vel singulari quadam proprietate," &c. Socin., Explic. Imi Cap. Joh.; Op., tom. i. p. 84. b. So also Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xii. pp. 476 sq.

<sup>f</sup> "יחיד", quod 'unigenam' aut 'unicum' significat, Græci sensum respicientes vertunt *ἀγαπητὸν* (dilectum)

ut Gen. xxii. 2. 12. 16, Judic. xi. 34, Jerem. vi. 26, Amos viii. 10, Zach. xii. 10; aut *ἀγαπώμενον* (dilectum), Prov. iv. 3; *ποθητὸν* (desideratum), Judic. xi. 34. Plutarchus: "*Ὁμηρος ἀγαπητὸν υἱὸν ὀνομάζει μόνον τηλόγετον, τοῦτέστι μὴ ἔχουσιν ἕτερον γονεῦσαι μὴδὲ ἔξουσιν γεγεννημένον.*" In *Odyssæa* secunda est '*μόνος ἔὼν ἀγαπητός.*' . . . Vide Matt. iii. 17, Marc. xii. 6. Sic Solomonem 'filium suum unicum,' id est, 'dilectissimum,' vocat David 1 Paral. xxix. 1; et ipse Solomo semet, dicto loco Prov. iv. 3. *Μονογενής* (unigenitus) ergo hic" (Joh. i. 14) "recte dicitur Christus eo quem diximus significatu; et cui addi potest, quia singulari modo a Deo processit." C ad Joh. i. 14.



*Pater et hujus Pleromatis; nec rursus in sinu Patris allerum* CHAP. XV.  
*quendam dicere tantam fabricasse creationem fas est, vel con-*  
*sentiente vel non consentiente*—"Now it is unreasonable and  
 impious to imagine any place, in which their Forefather and  
 Forebeginning, the Father of all and of this fulness, ceaseth  
 and endeth; nor is it lawful again to say, that any other in  
 the bosom of the Father made this great creation, either with  
 His consent or without it." For here you see, that the  
 Gnostics, feigning some principle besides the Father, but resi-  
 dent in His bosom, to have made the world, are reproved by  
 Irenæus for adulterating the Christian faith: which, main-  
 taining the Son to be in the bosom of the Father, signified  
 Him to be no stranger to the Father, but of His own nature.  
 Whereby we see further, what St. John means, when he says,  
 that "the Word was in the beginning with God," and "came [John i. 1;  
 into the world" from thence. In fine, when St. John attri- xvi. 28.]  
 butes to our Lord the title of "only-begotten," of "the light," [John i. 5.  
 and "the truth" (which he that reads Irenæus<sup>b</sup>, will see, that 9. 14. 18,  
 the Gnostics made several persons, constituting that "ful- xiv. 6, &c.]  
 ness," which several sects of them did imagine), it must be  
 concluded, that they, finding these titles attributed by the  
 Christians to our Lord, did, by attributing them to several  
 persons, of whom the several sects of them framed their sever-  
 al "fulnesses," adulterate Christianity; and that he, finding  
 them so doing, vindicates it to be the true sense, by fixing  
 the said titles, and the Godhead which they import, upon our  
 Lord Christ, where they are due.

§ 15. Here I allege the words of the Apostle, Heb. i. 3, How  
 concerning Christ; "Who being the brightness of His glory, Christ is  
 and the character of His substance, and sustaining" or the Bright-  
 "moving all things:" as it follows in those words which ness and  
 Image of  
 God.

<sup>a</sup> Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. ii. c. 7. pp. 127, 128.

<sup>b</sup> "Ταύτην δὲ" (Σιγήν) . . "ἀποκνή-  
 σαι Νοῦν, . . τὸν δὲ Νοῦν τοῦτον καὶ  
 Μονογενῆ καλοῦσι, . . συμπροβεβλήσθαι  
 δὲ αὐτῷ Ἀλήθειαν" . . αἰσθόμενον τε τὸν  
 Μονογενῆ τοῦτον ἐφ' οἷς προεβλήθη,  
 προβαλεῖν καὶ αὐτὸν Λόγον καὶ Ζωὴν,  
 πατέρα πάντων τῶν μετ' αὐτὸν ἐσομένων,  
 καὶ ἀρχὴν, καὶ μόρφωσιν πάντος τοῦ πλη-  
 ρώματος. Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λόγου," κ. τ. λ.  
 "Οἱ Τριάκοντα Αἰῶνες τῆς

πλάνης αὐτῶν" . . τοῦτο τὸ ἄόρατον καὶ  
 πνευματικὸν κατ' αὐτοὺς πλήρωμα."  
 Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 1. pp. 7—9.  
 —"Barbelon . . delectatam in hanc ge-  
 nerasse simile ei Lumen. Hanc ini-  
 tium et luminationis et generationis  
 omnium dicunt: et videntem Patrem  
 Lumen hoc, unxisse illud Sua benig-  
 nitate ut perfectum fieret. Hunc autem  
 dicunt esse Christum." Id., ibid., c.  
 33. pp. 106. b, 107. a.—See also ibid.,  
 lib. ii. c. 55. p. 184. b; and elsewhere.

BOOK  
II.

have been already examined. Which words the Socinians<sup>i</sup> think they avoid fairly, by saying, that as the words of men are all images of their minds, so the Man Jesus, being to signify (that is, to resemble) the counsel of God to mankind, is called the Image of God; as I said afore<sup>k</sup>, that He is called the Word of God in their sense. And to this they think the words of St. Paul inclinable, 2 Cor. iv. 4—6<sup>l</sup>: where he saith, that “the god of this world hath blinded the conceptions of unbelievers, that the enlightening of the glorious Gospel of Christ, Who is the Image of God, might not shine on them; for we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake; because it is God, Who commanded light to shine out of darkness, That hath shined in our hearts, to enlighten us with the knowledge of the glory of God in the face” (or “person) of Christ Jesus:” because in these words, which entitle Christ “the Image of God,” the preaching of the Gospel is so much insisted upon, as the reason of it. But, as for the reason, why our Lord is called the Word, I refer myself to the premises: so, that He should be entitled “the image of His glory,” the “character” that is printed off from “His substance;” that in consideration of the same He should have “purged man’s sins,” and be “set” on God’s throne, to be honoured with God’s own honours (which all follows in the Apostle’s words); is

[Heb. i. 3.]

<sup>i</sup> “Hæc est causa cur dicatur (Christus) Imago Dei invisibilis. Quia enim Ipsum Deum videri . . non possumus, in Christo tanquam Illius Imagine oculis nostris subjecta Eum intueri debemus. . . Enarrando enim ac Dei voluntatem explicando explicatamque confirmando Deum nobis spectandum exhibet. . . Eadem autem, vel simili de causa, et Character Substantiæ aut (ut alii vocem ‘hypostasis’ apud D. autorem vertunt) Personæ Dei dicitur; quia nimirum Deus in Eo Seipsum, h. e. voluntatem Suam, veluti ad vivum expressit, et oculis nostris spectandum exhibuit. . . Jam quod ad Verbi seu Sermonis vocabulum attinet, quo similiter Christus appellatur; . . Christum propter muneris Sui officium Verbum sive Sermonem Dei nominari, jam . . est a nobis indicatum; nempe quia Christus is fuit, per Quem primum Deus perfectissimam voluntatem Suam

nobis revelavit. . . Istud autem quod diximus Christi officium exprimitur Verbi sive Sermonis vocabulo, vel per metaphoricam, vel per metonymicam, dicendi figuram. Ac per metaphoram quidem sic, ut quemadmodum, quoties mentis nostræ cogitata alteri aperire cupimus, sermone utimur, ita Deus per Christum Ejusque disciplinam voluntatis Suae mysterium explicare nobis voluerit. Per metonymiam autem hoc pacto, ut Verbum sive Sermonem pro sermonis seu verbi præcone atque auctore poni intelligimus.” Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. v. c. x. pp. 434—436. And see also lib. iii. c. v. p. 47.

<sup>k</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 2. &c.

<sup>l</sup> “Christum porro nostri ratione Imaginem Dei dici, et animadverterunt alii, et ex illis Pauli verbis (2 Cor. iv. 4) apertum est: ‘Quod si opertum est Evangelium,’” &c. Volkel., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. v. c. x. p. 434.



too gross for any reasonable man to digest. And, therefore, in the title of "God's Image" (as I said before, in the title of God's Word) there must be couched and understood a reason, upon which all this may flow; which is nothing else but the "fulness of the Spirit," or "the Godhead," lodged for ever in the flesh of our Lord, and rendering Him capable, as well to redeem all sins, and to be advanced to the throne of God, that is, to the worship of God, as to preach and make good that Gospel, wherein the glory of God's wisdom and goodness so much appeareth. And thus, and not otherwise, the account will be sufficient: not only why our Lord is entitled "the Image of God," but how He is preached to be "the Lord," and the Apostles "His slaves;" how "the glory of God" shines off from "His person," or "face," upon the "hearts" of believers. For I do firmly believe,—as the Apostles' writings have always reference to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to shew how they are fulfilled by the New, so—that our Lord is here called "the Image of God," as the second Adam: in reference to the first, who is said to have been made "in the image and likeness of God;" but with that  
 111 difference which St. Paul hath expressed, 1 Cor. xv. 45, "As it is written, the first Adam was made a living soul, so is the second Adam made a quickening spirit." For having shewed, that the spirit of life which raised Christ from the dead, is the fulness of the Godhead hypostatically united to the flesh of Christ; well may I infer, that it is in consideration thereof, that He is called "the image of God's glory, and the express character of His substance:" from which will also follow the expiation of our sins, and His sitting upon God's throne, to be worshipped as God. Thus shall "the first Adam," made "a living soul" in "the image of God," be the figure of "the second Adam," made "a quickening spirit" in "the image of God." Thus shall the Old Testament be the figure of the New; and the animal life, given by the Word and Spirit of God, the figure of spiritual and everlasting life, given by the same Spirit of God dwelling in the Word of God incarnate.

§ 16. I will here shew you the strange tale, that Saturninus framed out of the relation of Moses concerning the making of man, related by Epiphanius<sup>m</sup>; that you may judge

<sup>m</sup> Epiphan., Adv. Hær., lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. 23. § 1; Op., tom. i. p. 62. C, D.

BOOK  
II.

thereby of the truth of that which he endeavoured to disguise. “Ἐπειδὴ [γάρ], φησιν, ἄνωθεν τὸ αὐτὸ φῶς παρακύψαν, ἐρεθισμὸν τινα ἐνεποίησε τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀγγέλοις, τούτους πρὸς πόθον τοῦ ἄνω ὁμοιώματος ἐπιχειρήσαι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ πλάσμα ποιῆσαι· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἠράσθησαν τοῦ ἄνω φωτός, πόθῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ” (so I read Epiphanius, instead of “πρὸς αὐτοὺς,” which makes no sense<sup>n</sup>), “[καὶ

[“ἀφαντωθέντος.”  
ed. Petav.]

[“θήξιν.”  
ed. Petav.]

[“δραματουργῶν.”  
ed. Petav.]

ἡδοιῇ] κατασχεθέντες, φανέντος καὶ ἀφανισθέντος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ἐρασθέντας τε αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ δυνηθέντας ἐμπλησθῆναι τῆς ἐρασμιότητος αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ θίξιν ἀναπτῆναι τὸ αὐτοῦ φῶς, τούτου χάριν εἰρηκέναι φησὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, δραματουργεῖ ὁ αὐτὸς γόης, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον”—“Because, saith he, that same light (which was the image of the power above), peeping down, wrought a certain provocation in the said angels” (by whom he saith the world was made<sup>o</sup>), “they attempted to frame man out of the lust they had to the image above: for, being in love with the light above, and taken with the lust of it, appearing and disappearing to them, and unable to satisfy themselves of the comeliness of that which they were in love with, because his light flew up as soon as it came at them, hereupon this juggler frames the scene, and says that the angels said, Let us make man:” to wit, “according to *the* image,” not “according to *our* image<sup>p</sup>;” because he denies, that man was made after the image of God That made the world, but after the image of the unknown Father, which peeped down upon them in “the fulness of the Godhead,” and drew back straight: shewing thereby, that the Christian faith which he meant to sophisticate, makes “the living soul,” to which the first Adam was framed, to be the image of God, because the “quickening spirit,” which our Lord Christ was to become by being incarnate, was figured by it.

<sup>n</sup> Petavius reads “πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς αὐτό.” The older editions (e. g. fol. Basil. 1544. p. 32), “πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς αὐτούς.” Thorndike has omitted the words in translating the passage.

<sup>o</sup> Epiphanius, *ibid.*, B.

<sup>p</sup> Epiphanius continues his statement thus—“Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν· παρακύψας τὸ

εἰρημένον ἐν τῇ Γενέσει” (Gen. i. 26.) “ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ καθ’ ἡμετέραν. Ἐάσας τὸ ἡμετέραν, ἵνα δὴ ἔχη ἡ πλάνη αὐτοῦ τὴν πιθανότητα, ὥς δῆθεν ἄλλων μὲν ποιοῦντων, εἰκόνα δὲ ἐτέρου λέγειν ἐν τῷ Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν.” *Id.*, *ibid.*, pp. 62. D, 63. A.



## CHAPTER XVI.

THE TESTIMONIES OF CHRIST'S GODHEAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT ARE FIRST UNDERSTOOD OF THE FIGURES OF CHRIST. OF THE WISDOM OF GOD IN SOLOMON AND ELSEWHERE. OF THE WRITINGS OF THE JEWS AS WELL BEFORE AS AFTER CHRIST.

BE this then the evidence of the state of our Lord Christ afore His coming in the flesh, out of the Scriptures of the New Testament. The sense of which to make good, I have been forced to employ two peremptory arguments, grounded upon that reason upon which we admit the New Testament to have been signified by the Old: the first, the name and honour of God alone, given to the angels that were employed by God to speak to His prophets in His own person and name<sup>1</sup> as the forerunners of our Lord; the second, those passages of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah, which attribute to Him the name and works and honour of God, and by those that admit the New Testament cannot be denied to belong to our Lord Jesus, as by the Jews themselves they are most an end acknowledged to belong to the Messiah. And of this I was to put the reader in mind<sup>2</sup>, that he may expect this truth out of the Old Testament by evidences answerable to that declaration thereof, which the light of that time required.

§ 2. For I shall freely avow, that the next argument that I shall use, standeth absolutely upon supposition of that which I delivered in the first Book<sup>3</sup>, concerning the figuring of the Messiah by those persons, of whom the prophets of the Old Testament writ: so that the sense of the passages which I shall now allege, is in some sort fulfilled and verified in those things which fell out to those figures; though, admitting the said ground, it will be requisite to look after a more perfect and complete verifying of them in our Lord Christ:

The testimonies of Christ's Godhead in the Old Testament.

[They] are first understood of the figures of Christ: [but more perfectly and completely verified in Christ Himself.]

<sup>1</sup> Corrected from MS. "names," in orig. text.

<sup>2</sup> See above, c. x. § 7; c. xi. § 1.

<sup>3</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 26—47; and particularly § 38.

BOOK  
II.[vv. 6, 7.  
Eng. vers.][Prayer  
bk. vers.]

whereupon it cannot be strange, that the meaning of them should appear more full and proper in Him, than it can be maintained in them, of whom it cannot be denied that they are meant in the Old Testament. Such is that memorable passage of the Prophet David, Psalm xlv. 8, 9 [Hebr.] : "Thy seat, O God, is for ever; the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a sceptre of righteousness: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." And Psalm lxxii. 15: "He shall live, and unto Him shall be given of the gold of Arabia; prayer shall be made ever unto Him, and daily shall He be praised." Of the same kind is that of the Prophet Isaiah, ix. 6, 7: "A little One is given us; a Son is born us; on Whose shoulder is the rule; and His name shall be called the Admirable, the Counsellor, the mighty God, the Father of eternity, the Prince of peace: of the greatness of His empire and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David and his kingdom, to restore and settle it in judgment and righteousness from this time forth for evermore." And Isaiah xi. 1—3: "And there shall come forth a shoot from the root of Jesse, and a bud shall come up from his stock; upon whom shall rest the Spirit of the Lord; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and godliness; and he shall smell with the fear of the Lord." And Jer. xxiii. 5, 6: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a sprout of righteousness, and He shall reign as a king, and be wise, and execute judgment and righteousness upon the earth; in His days shall Judah be saved, and Israel dwell safe; and this is the name by which they shall call Him, The Lord our righteousness:" or, "our righteous Lord." For I do avow and maintain, that all that will justify, that our Lord is foretold and figured in the Old Testament, upon true grounds, and consequent to their own sayings, must say, that these things are verified of some prince of God's ancient people. This of Jeremy for the purpose in Zorobabel<sup>t</sup>: who is called "the sprout," Zach.

[ "The  
Branch."  
Eng. vers.]

<sup>t</sup> "Germen Justum—Zorobabalem, qui צמח [germen aut surculus], ut hic appellatur, ita et Zachariæ vi. 12.

Nimirum quod velut surculus renatus esset ex arbore Davidis quasi præcisa. Justitiæ nomine commendatur Zoro-



113 vi. 12; and "king," Zach. ix. 9; Jer. xxxi. 7<sup>u</sup>. Those things of Esay, in Ezekias<sup>s</sup>. As those things of David no man doubts to be fulfilled first in Solomon; of whom the title of Psalm lxxii. says expressly, that it is intended<sup>v</sup>. Neither will I make any difficulty to yield the Socinians, that the title of Zorobabel may well be "God is our righteousness;" or that the title of Ezekias, in Isai. vii. 14, may well be "God is with us:" no otherwise, than the pillar which Moses erected, Exod. xvii. 15, is called "the Lord my standard;" or the altar of Isaac, Gen. xxxiii. 20, "God the God of Abraham<sup>s</sup>." But when it is granted on their side (which the Jews themselves cannot refuse<sup>a</sup>), that these things are meant in a more sublime sense of the Messiah; and that, in respect of salvation purchased us, and Divine honours to

CHAP.  
XVI.

[Jer. xxiii. 6.]  
["Emma-nuel."]  
["Jehovah-nissi."]  
["Elohe-Israel."]

babel etiam apud Zachariam ix. 9." Grot., ad Jerem. xxiii. 5. See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 41. — "For much the same reason do the later Jews make Zorobabel to be spoken of in Isaiah xi. 1, 2. Manass. Qu. 18. on Isaiah. Though not only St. Paul understood it of Jesus Christ, Rom. xv. 12, 2 Thess. ii. 8; but the ancient Jews did generally refer it to the Messiah, as appears all along in the Targum of that chapter." Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch. against Unit., c. xxvi. p. 325. "Jonathan, as well as Philo, ascribes to the Messiah the prophecies Zech. vi. 12, 13; . . . but many of the modern Jews, among whom R. Salomon is one, do refer them to Zorobabel." Id., ibid., p. 328.—Sommerus, De Justif. cont. Carol., p. 44, interprets Micah v. 2 of Zorobabel, according to Scherzer, Colleg. Anti-Socin., Diss. xvi. p. 142.—See also Pearson, On the Creed, Art. vi. vol. ii. note q. p. 379; for a similar interpretation by the Jews of Ps. cx.

<sup>u</sup> This reference is incorrect. Jerem. xxx. 9—"But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them"—seems to be the passage intended. "David regi suo"—id est Zorobabeli. . . Is David vocatur et hic et Ezech. xxxiv. 23, et xxxvii. 24." Grot., ad Jerem. xxx. 9.

<sup>s</sup> So Grot., ad Isai. ix. 6, xi. 1: but referring them also to the Messiah—"Sub quibus sensu sublimiore latent Messiae laudes."—"Ezekias populum conservaturus intelligitur, Esai. ix. 6." Sommerus, De Justif. cont.

Carol., pp. 59 sq.; as quoted by Scherzer, Colleg. Anti-Socin., Disp. xvi. p. 144.—"Jonathan in his paraphrase on Isai. ix. 6, interprets the text of the Messiah; . . . and so did the most ancient Jewish writers. But after Jesus Christ, the Jews having broken up a new way, it has pleased some of their late writers to tread in the steps of R. Hillel, and to apply that text to Hezekiah. So does Salomon Jarchi, David Kimchi, Abenezra, and Lipman." Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch. against Unit., c. xxvi. p. 325.—See also Pearson, On the Creed, Art. vi. vol. ii. note k. p. 378; for a similar interpretation by the Jews of Ps. cx.

<sup>v</sup> "A Psalm for Solomon." And see below, note g; and Grot., ad Ps. lxxii. 1.

<sup>a</sup> The Socinians either deny those words, "Jehovah our Righteousness," to be spoken of Christ (but of Jerusalem or Israel); or, admitting this, assert them "to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition: and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to infer as much. As Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi," &c. Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii. vol. ii. note u. p. 182. So Socin., Cont. Vujuk., c. vi.; Op., tom. ii. pp. 601. b, 602. a: Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Person. Christi, c. i. p. 34: Crellius, De Deo, ap. Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. i. c. xi. p. 84.

<sup>x</sup> See above, notes t, x; and Pearson, On the Creed, Art. ii. vol. ii. note u. p. 181.

BOOK II. Himself (which the Socinians cannot refuse<sup>b</sup>, though the Jews

do), those things which are said of God in the Old Testament are attributed to our Lord Christ in the New: then will I stand upon it, that 'the throne of the most high God,' ascribed to our Lord Christ by David, imports no more than when he says, Psalm cx. 1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool:" and, therefore, that there can be no cause either to abate this<sup>c</sup> signification of the name of God, when the prophet saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever<sup>d</sup>," or to have recourse to that other shift, that God is said to be Christ's throne, because the founder of it; when it is manifest, that the throne which is spoken of is God's throne<sup>e</sup>. For it is to be considered, that, when it is said, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" using that name of God which is communicated to His angels, and to the rulers of His people<sup>f</sup>, and therefore, in the first place, to the Messias, that is, to our Lord Jesus, supposing Him to be the Christ: whatsoever conceit of the Messias the Old Testament can allow, when the New declareth, that our Lord Jesus is "set down at God's right hand" upon His own throne, it necessarily declareth Him the same God with Him, upon Whose throne He sits. In like manner, I do not deny, but challenge and maintain, that the prayers and praises tendered the Messias according to David, may and must be understood to be such as might be tendered to Solomon an earthly prince<sup>g</sup>. But when I can charge all that admit the New Testament, by their own consent, that it is the honour of the

[Ps. xlv.  
6.]

[Heb. i.  
3. 8.]

<sup>b</sup> See above, c. xiv. § 3. notes k, l.

<sup>c</sup> Corrected from MS. "abuse the," in orig. text.

<sup>d</sup> "Si tamen vocem Dei hoc loco" (Rom. ix. 5.) "de Christo usurpavit, illo ipso id fecit sensu, quo Eum Dominum Illum unum a Deo factum appellat. Nam et Ps. xlv. hoc sensu Christus appellatur Deus: 'Thronus Tuus, o Deus,'" &c. Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 59. b.

<sup>e</sup> "Thronus Tuus Deus," &c.; "Sensus ergo est, 'Deus Ipse est sedes Tua perpetua; id est, si Salomonem respicimus, 'sicut sedes inconcussos tenent homines, ita Deus te semper in

regno sustentabit;' si Christum, 'Deus Ipse Te sustentabit in regno nunquam desituro.'" Grot., ad Heb. i. 8.

<sup>f</sup> Scil. אֱלֹהִים; "quod nomen pluribus sive angelis sive iudicibus dari solet, at cum uni tribuitur, Deo soli convenit." Grot., ad Heb. i. 8.

<sup>g</sup> "It is granted by the modern Jews, that their fathers understood Psalm lxxii. of the Messias. So R. Saadia on Dan. vii. 14; Salomon Jarchi on Psalm lxxii. 6; and Bahal Haturim ad Numb. xxvi. 16. And yet now they stick not (of which R. David Kimchi is a witness) to interpret it only of Solomon." Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch. against Unit., c. xxvi. p. 324.



only true God which Christians tender our Lord Christ, of Whom they agree that this is said<sup>h</sup>; when I can charge the Jews themselves, acknowledging likewise that this is meant of the Messias<sup>i</sup>, that the title and works and attributes and worship of God are ascribed to the Messias, even by the Old Testament: I need not be thought to weaken the cause of our common Christianity, by making the ground of it unremoveable. Neither shall I stick by the same reason to acknowledge, among the rest of those titles which Isaiah prophesieth of Ezekias, not that "His name shall be the mighty God," but that, as the pillar of Moses is called "God is my standard," so the title of Ezekias shall be "God is mighty;" [Isai. ix. because of the might God should shew by him, in doing<sup>6</sup>] good to His people. And as I will not say, that he can be called the "father of eternity;" so I can say, and do, that [Isai. ix. whosoever will maintain, that God intended that Moses' law should cease (which is so often said to be given "for ever" in the Scripture), must grant, that those words, which may signify eternity when the matter or circumstance of the speech requires, do signify no more than a time whereof the term is unknown<sup>k</sup>, in the Old Testament. I say likewise, that the then people of God were to understand, that Isaiah promised them God's Spirit, and the graces thereof, to rest upon their princes, by whom He promiseth them deliverance. But, all this being granted, when it is either granted or proved on the other side, that the name and works and titles and worship of the only true God are ascribed and challenged to our Lord Christ by His Word of the New or Old Testament, and the grounds upon which the meaning of it is evidenced upon supposition hereof, I will nevertheless challenge that sense of these prophecies in behalf of our Lord Christ, by virtue of the subject matter of the New Testament and the whole current thereof, determining the capacity of those words wherein these prophecies are delivered, unto it. For I profess and maintain, that the difference between the literal and mystical sense of the Old Testament (necessary to be maintained by all that will main-

<sup>h</sup> See note d.<sup>i</sup> See above, note g.<sup>k</sup> "עולם, proprie 'occultum,' speci-

aliter 'tempus occultum, absconditum, diuturnum.' Gesen. in voc.

BOOK  
II.

tain the truth of Christianity against the Jews) cannot be maintained, without granting such an equivocation in the words of it, as the correspondence between the kingdom of heaven and that of Israel, the priesthood of Christ and Aaron, the prophetic office of Joshua and Jesus, in fine, between the land of Canaan and the heavenly paradise, produceth<sup>1</sup>: and that, when this is maintained throughout the Scripture, then is that great work of God's wisdom, in making way for the Gospel by the Law, glorified to the conviction of the Jews; which, when it is sometimes challenged, and elsewhere waved, becomes a stumbling block to the obstinacy of that wilful people.

Of the Wisdom of God, in Solomon and elsewhere.

§ 3. It remains, that I omit not those things which Solomon preaches of the Wisdom of God; in so sublime and mysterious language, that when we read St. Paul entitling Christ, "The power of God and the wisdom of God," 1 Cor. i. 24, we cannot refuse to understand them of the Godhead dwelling in His flesh, as the Church hath always done. 'Wisdom was at the making of all things—was brought forth before any thing was made—God's delight—that delights itself in God's works, especially in conversing with mankind;' Prov. viii. 22—31. Add hereunto Prov. iv. 7; "ראשית חכמה"—"Wisdom is the principal," or "beginning"—"ἀρχὴ σοφία." Add Prov. iii. 19, 20; that God made heaven and earth "by Wisdom." Add the words of a prophet, to whom God sends his friends to be expiated and reconciled to God, Job xlii. 7, 8: that 'Wisdom is known to God alone, as that which He looked upon when He ordained the creation of the universe;' Job xxviii. 20—28. Add the Prophet David, signifying the same in fewer words; "In Wisdom hast Thou made them all" (Psalm civ. 24): that Wisdom, which saith to all men by Job (xxviii. 28), by David (Psalm cxi. 10), by Solomon (Prov. i. 7; ix. 10; Eccl. xii. 13), "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom:" in which wisdom, the whole business of Solomon's doctrine seems to be, that the whole happiness of man consisteth.

[Socinus's anti-Christians gloss.]

§ 4. Is all this with Socinus<sup>m</sup> but a figure of rhetoric called

<sup>1</sup> See above, c. iii. § 2—4.

<sup>m</sup> "Et sane, si quis non videt, Salomonem per prosopopeiam de Sapientia in genere et in abstracto loqui, quæ

nullo modo Christus esse potest, is permulta quæ in eo cap. (Prov. viii.)



prosopopœia; whereby Solomon brings in Wisdom, in the person of God's favourite, to signify that it comes from God, and to inflame all men to love that which Solomon had prayed for to God, to make him a happy prince: 1 Kings iii. 9, 11, 12; 2 Chron. i. 10, 11? Truly this were something for a Jew to acknowledge, that the wisdom of God's people (which Moses also shews consisted in their laws, Deut. iv. 6) came from God, to order their doings to God. For from hence it will follow, that, as those that are to give account to God of the most inward intentions and inclinations of the heart, so are they obliged to order them, and all the productions of them, according to His will, and to His honour and service. But for a Christian, that hath learnt the whole work of the Law to have been preparative to that which our Lord by His Gospel was to do, and that before the Law the fathers were instructed to live as Christians now do or should do (the Law adding nothing but civil laws, to enforce the obedience of them that rebelled against their discipline, and ceremonies, to figure the Gospel to come); for such a one not to understand,—when God's prophets proclaim, that the Wisdom by which God made the world, takes delight to converse with mankind, to reduce it from idols to the worship of God, to stir up prophets to preserve them in it, and to foretell Christ to come,—that the same Wisdom, which did this afterwards in our flesh, did it afore without it, is a fault to the Christianity which he professeth.

§ 5. He that writ the Wisdom of Solomon, though no Christian, saw more, when he said, Wisd. x. 1, 2, "This" (Wisdom) "preserved the first father of the world, who was made alone, and drew him out of his sin, and gave him

CHAP.  
XVI.

[The Apocryphal  
Book of  
Wisdom.]

et sequente scripta sunt, parum attente legit." Socin., Defens. Animadv. in Assert. Theol. Collegii Posnan., cont. Eutrop.; Op., tom. ii. p. 666. a.—"Ex quibus locis . . . satis potest unusquisque intelligere, Salomonem ubique de sapientia in genere et in abstracto per prosopopœiam loqui; et quando de ea vocanda agit, nihil aliud significare velle, quam ejus ardens desiderium et acquisitionem." Id., ibid., p. 668. b.—So also Resp. ad Vujek., c. vii.; ibid., p. 606. a, b.—"Unde perspicuum est, non id egisse Solomonem, ut Sapientiam illam Divinam quandam per-

sonam esse ostenderet: sed ideo per prosopopœiam Eam tanta de Se prædicantem induxisse, ut hominum animos Ejus studio ac cupiditate inflammaret, atque ad eam acquirendam incenderet. Eam ob rem ibidem superius hanc illam esse dicit per quam reges regnant," &c. "Hanc denique alibi sine dubio (1 Reg. iii. 9, 11, 12, 2 Paral. i. 10, 11) a Deo sibi donari petit, ut omnia sapienter moderari atque administrare possit." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. xii. p. 471.—So also Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 33.

BOOK II. strength to rule all things:" proceeding to shew the same of the fathers that succeed. The same author, having prefaced (Wisd. vi. 22), that he would shew how wisdom was brought forth, adds, Wisd. vii. 22—27, that description which attributes to Wisdom the same that the Apostle ascribes to Christ: 'The image' or 'shine of God's glory and substance—the unstained mirror of His virtue—the breath of His power—the flowing forth of the glory of the most High—which sustaineth all things that He made—and, remaining<sup>115</sup> the same, reneweth' (or 'maketh new') all things—and settling upon holy men's minds, makes them God's friends and prophets.' And this, having premised, that "the Spirit of God goes through all the world;" and that Wisdom is a spirit that convinceth the secret perverseness of the heart: Wisd. i. 5—7. Then, of the death of the first-born in Egypt, [Wisd.] xviii. 14—16: "For when all things were possessed by still silence, and night was at the middle of her course, Thy almighty Word came from Thy royal throne in heaven, strong as a man of war, into the midst of a land to be destroyed, bringing Thy unfeigned command like a sharp sword, and standing filled all with death, while reaching to heaven He stood upon the earth."

[Ecclesiasticus.]  
[Ecclus. i. 9, 10.]

§ 6. The like you have in the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, when he proclaimeth that Wisdom which God brought forth, and by which He made all things, to be the author of that wisdom which he teacheth.

[Baruch.]

§ 7. And in the additions to Jeremy under the name of Baruch in the Greek bibles; shewing the Israelites [Baruch iii. 12—34], that they were in bondage for deserting that way of wisdom, which, unknown to the idolatrous nations, He that founded the earth, and ordained the rest of the world by wisdom, hath seen and made known to them; adds immediately, Baruch iii. [35—37]; "This is our God, nor shall any other be valued besides Him; He found out the way of knowledge, and gave it to Jacob His servant, and to Israel His beloved; afterwards, He appeared on earth, and conversed with men." Which words I much marvel to see stand suspected to some great scholars, as foisted in by Christian copyists<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>n</sup> "Hoc est ex illis quæ dixi" (in Præfat.) "a Christiano aliquo exscriptore addita." Grot., ad Baruch iii. 38.



For what do they import more, than that the Wisdom of God, which dealt with men by the flesh of Christ, dealt with them afore by the prophets? Which the Jews themselves, who deny the Wisdom of God to be incarnate in our Lord Christ, cannot refuse.

§ 8. This "Wisdom of God," this "Word of God," this "Spirit of God," this "Image of His glory," this "mirror of His substance, by Which He made the world," coming to holy men by the ministry of angels (in whom it was resident for that service), "made them God's friends and prophets;" as, coming to us in the flesh of Christ (which He took, never to let go), it hath made us the children of God, that is, Christians. This is indeed that great figure, in which the eloquence of the Old Testament consisteth: and may be called, as by the Greek fathers many times it is, "*οἰκονομία*," or "good husbandry" of language; intimating the way of God's dispensing the knowledge of Himself, which that time was capable of, by such sparing expressions, as, being expounded by the appearance of our Lord Christ in the flesh, may well make all doubt of the true intent of them to vanish°. And, therefore, I must needs applaud the practice of the primitive Church, related afore out of St. Athanasius (*in Synopsi Scripturæ*<sup>p</sup>), and others<sup>q</sup>, to instruct the learners of Christianity out of those books which we now call Apocrypha. For by this point, which containeth the sum of Christianity, it doth appear (as also by divers others it may appear), that the secret of Christianity (folded up in the writings of the prophets, unfolded in the writings of the Apostles), though the same for substance, yet (without disparagement to the prophets, because the counsel of God required it) is more clearly and plainly set forth in them than in the writings of the prophets; as the twilight is a degree to the light which the sunrise bringeth with it.

§ 9. What impressions of this sense may yet be discerned in the Jews' writings, I will not stand to enquire here; where I write to all English, so far as they are capable of those things; wherein they are all concerned, whether capable or

CHAP.  
XVI.

[Figurative or 'æconomical' language.]

[Wisd. vii. 27.]

Of the writings of the Jews as well before as after Christ.

<sup>a</sup> See above, c. xiv. § 16. note i.

xxxi. § 36. note s.

<sup>p</sup> Op., tom. ii. p. 128. ed. Bened.  
See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c.

<sup>q</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.,  
ibid., notes t, v, x.

BOOK  
II.

not: remitting the readers that are capable, to those that maintain the truth of Christianity against the Jews; and to those things, which Grotius upon the beginning of St. John's Gospel<sup>r</sup> (whereof hitherto I maintain the true meaning), and upon other texts which I have employed to that purpose, hath observed out of the Chaldee paraphrase, Philo the Jew, and others of that nation; besides divers heathen philosophers, whose sayings, otherwise ungrounded, seem to come from the sense of that people. One thing I will observe, which is very ordinary among their ancient doctors, to call the angel which speaks to the fathers under the proper name and in the person of God, "Metatron";<sup>s</sup> signifying neither more nor less than *Metator* in Latin, as you may see in Buxtorfius his great Lexicon<sup>t</sup>; that is, a harbinger, or quartermaster of lodgings. Whereof it is impossible to give so fit a reason as this, that they understood him to be the fore-runner or harbinger of the Messiah; and therefore the Messiah is our Lord Jesus: the ancient fathers of the Church having declared, from the very mouth of the Apostles, that those dispensations were managed by the Word of God, now dwelling in our flesh, as prefaces and preludes to the incarnation of our Lord, making way for it by the ministry of the prophets, as St. John the Baptist did at a nearer distance before His coming<sup>u</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> "Rabbi Eliezel, 'Ante mundum creatum extitit clemens et benignus Deus et Nomen Ejus solum.'" Grot., in Joh. i. l.—"Censent Hebræi veteres et Christianorum primi, quoties angelus aliquis in sacris libris appellatur יהוה [Jehova], tunc non angelum merum sed cui adfuerit δ Λόγος [Verbum] intelligi. Sic interpretatur Moses Gerundensis illud 'Nomen Meum in Eo est,' Exod. xxiii. 21. Chaldæus Paraphrastes, Genes. xxix. 20, 'Erit Verbum Domini missi in Deum.' Et Ezechielis i. 24, קול-שרי [Vocem Omnipotentis], Septuaginta vertunt 'φωνήν του Λόγου' [Vocem Verbi]. Sed et apud Philonem Λόγος [Verbum] vocatur Θεός [Dei] nomine. Chalcidius ad Timæum, eo libro ubi doctrinam eminentem sectæ sanctioris, id est, Judaicæ, explicare se profitetur; 'Et Ratio Dei Deus est humanis rebus consulens, Quæ causa est hominibus

bene beateque vivendi, si non concessum sibi munus a Summo Deo negligant.'" Id., ibid., &c.—See also Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch., cc. xii.—xvi. at length.

<sup>s</sup> "The Jews . . . were hard put to it by the objections drawn from Exod. xxiii. 21, about that angel whom God had promised for a leader to Israel, in whom God's name was to be, and who is called by the Jews 'Metatron.'" Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch., c. xx. p. 261.

<sup>t</sup> "מטטרון, Metatron. Nomen angeli cujus passim mentio apud Rabbinos. In Targum Jonathanis," &c. "Omnino videtur esse ex origine præcedentis vocis מיטטור Metator, q. d. Metator, Legatus Dei." Buxtorf, Lexic. Chald. Talmud. et Rabbin., sub voce.

<sup>u</sup> See above, c. xiii. § 3.



## CHAPTER XVII.

ANSWER TO THOSE TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE THAT SEEM TO ABATE THE TRUE GODHEAD IN CHRIST. OF THAT CREATURE WHEREOF CHRIST IS THE FIRST-BORN, AND THAT WHICH THE WISDOM OF GOD MADE. THAT THIS BELIEF IS THE ORIGINAL TRADITION OF THE CHURCH. WHAT MEANS THIS DISPUTE FURNISHETH US WITH AGAINST THE ARIANS. THAT IT IS REASON TO SUBMIT TO REVELATION CONCERNING THE NATURE OF GOD. THE USE OF REASON IS NO WAY RENOUNCED BY HOLDING THIS FAITH.

I HAVE, in this defence, given the true meaning to very many texts of Scripture, that are alleged against the faith of the Church. Some remain, which I think fit to repeat and answer in this abridgment.

§ 2. There be those \*, that lay a great weight upon that of our Lord, John xvii. 3; "This is eternal life, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent." But the same exclusive "only," or something of the same force, is found in many other places. 1 Cor. viii. 4—6; "There is no other God but one." Ephes. iv. 6; "One God and Father of all." 1 Tim. ii. 5; "There is one God, and one Mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus." And wheresoever we read "the only God," or "the only wise God," or the like. The rest are not many that I shall name. Matt. xxiv. 36, [Mark xiii. 32<sup>v</sup>]; "Of that day and hour

Answer to those texts of Scripture that seem to abate the true Godhead in Christ.

["and men."] [Matt. iv. 10; Mark ii. 7; Luke iv. 8; John v. 44; Gal. iii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16; Jude 4; Rev. xv. 4. —Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25.]

\* "Illud porro Christi enunciatum, quam clarum evidensque est, quo Patrem Suum solum verum Deum esse testificatur? 'Hæc est vita æterna, ut cognoscant solum verum Deum.' Joh. xvii. 3. Quorum verborum hanc mentem esse, ut Te Pater, Qui Es solus verus Deus, agnoscant, omnes facile intelligunt, qui cæcutire in media luce nolunt. Non ignoro, quantopere hic sese torqueant nonnulli, ut testimonium hoc tam luculentum eludant. Jam enim Christi verba distincte prolata, una eaque falsissima implicant sententia, quasi hunc in modum legantur, 'Hæc est vita æterna ut cognoscant Te, et Quem misisti Jesum Christum, esse solum verum Deum.' Jam vero particulam 'solus,' communem pluribus Personis Essentiam respicere

ajunt; et sic, cum de Patre prædicatur, nequaquam opponi reliquis Personis, sed idolis fallacibusque Dis: aut vocabulum 'solus' non ad subjectum sed ad prædicatum referri, cum Christus non dixerit, solum Patrem esse verum Deum, sed Patrem esse solum verum Deum; ideoque reliquas Personas nequaquam excludi. Jam quod ad primum effugium attinet," &c. Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. v. c. ix. pp. 418, 419; and c. x. p. 424.—So also Socin., in his Animadv. in Assert. Theol. de Trino et Uno Deo, in Assert. xviii.; Op., tom. ii. p. 431. a, b.—And Crellius, De Uno Deo Patre, lib. I. sect. i. c. 1. § 3—25; in fin. Volkel. De Vera Relig.

† Added in MS.

BOOK II. knoweth no man, nor the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone." Col. i. 15, "The first-born of the whole creature," seemeth to rank Christ with the creatures, being of the same birth. John xiv. 28; "The Father is greater than I."

[How the Father is "the only true God."]

§ 3. For answer to the first, I will not insist, that the words are to be construed thus,—“This is eternal life, to know Thee, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent, to be the only true God;” or thus,—“To know Thee only to be the true God, and to know Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent.” For the Greek article, which the Latin wanteth, the English punctually answereth, determines the words “τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν”—“the only true God,” to go together, as agreeing in the same case with “Thee,” that went afore<sup>a</sup>. But this I say, that the exceptive “only” can by no reason be understood to exclude the attributes<sup>a</sup> of the true God, which it restrains in these words to the Father, from any, that, by the sense of him that speaks them, can be understood to be included in it. And that the sense of our Lord may be, notwithstanding this “only,” to include the Son in the property of this attribute, “the true God,” I go no further than the sense of all Christians; who all affirm the Father to be “the only true God,” but believe the Son to be the same “only true God” nevertheless. And that this is His sense, I refer myself to the titles, attributes, works, and worship of the only true God, challenged hitherto from His words. And this sense, the words of St. John (the meaning whereof according to the ordinary reading, I have shewed before<sup>b</sup> not to advantage Socinus) seem to intend according to the true reading; which the Vulgar Latin<sup>c</sup> (justified by the Marquis of Velez his Spanish copies, as you may see by the readings added to the Great Bible<sup>d</sup>) preserveth:—“We know that the Son of

<sup>a</sup> So also Volkel. and Crellius, as quoted in note x; arguing against the rendering of the verse given above in the text.

<sup>a</sup> Corrected from MS. “attribute,” in orig. text.

<sup>b</sup> Above, c. xiv. § 8.

<sup>c</sup> “Et scimus quoniam Filius Dei venit, et dedit nobis sensum ut cognoscamus verum Deum, et simus in vero Filio Ejus. Hic est verus Deus,

et vita æterna.” 1 Joh. v. 20. Vulg.

<sup>d</sup> “Ἀληθινὸν—Lin. March. Veles. Steph. 4. 5. 10. 11. addunt Θεόν. Ib. ἐσμὲν—March. Veles. ὁμῶς. Ib. ἐν τῷ . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ—March. Veles. desunt.” Variantes Lectt. Græc. N. T., in fin. tom. vi. Waltoni Bibl. Polygl., p. 34, in 1 Joh. v. 20. “March. Veles.” stands for various readings, said to be “collectæ per Marchionem Velezium Petrum Fraxardum Hispanum,



God is come, and hath given us<sup>r</sup> understanding to know the true one; *et sumus in vero Filio Ejus Jesu Christo*—and we are in His true Son Jesus Christ; This is the true God and eternal life:” whereas it is ordinarily read, “And we are in the true One, in His Son Christ;” or “through His Son Jesus Christ:” 1 John v. 20. For it seemeth, that the Apostle, folding up both attributes, of “the true One” (that is, as it followeth, “the true God”) and “the true Son of God,” in our Lord Christ, pointeth at the words of our Lord, recorded by himself alone, John xvii. 3, “This is eternal life, to know Thee the only true God, and Whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ;” challenging for Him, that He is no more to be excluded from the title of “only true God,” than from that of author of “eternal life.” If it be said, this cannot be, because there would be then more than one “only true God,” the answer is ready,—that this is not an argument from the force of these words, that this cannot be the sense of them; but from the light of reason, that this sense cannot be true. I know it is a trick that Crellius puts upon the reader, throughout his first Book *De Deo Trino et Uno*<sup>t</sup>, that the sense of the Church is not the sense of the Scriptures, because it contradicteth the evidence of nature’s light. But when the sense of the Scripture is in question, the dictate of

CHAP.  
XVII.  
[“si-  
mus.”]

facta collatione sexdecim exemplarium, quorum octo erant ex Bibliotheca Regis Hispaniæ Laurentiana.” Ibid., p. 1. And the whole verse therefore in these (alleged) Spanish MSS. would run thus — “Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καὶ ὅμεν ἐν τῷ Ἀληθινῷ. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος.”—But Griesbach (Pref. to N. T., p. 30) asserts of the so called “Lectiones Velelianæ,” that they are “e Latinis codicibus collectæ et Græcis vocabulis expressæ.” And although J. D. Michaelis (Introd. to N. T., vol. ii. c. viii. sect. vi.) endeavours to prove, that the Greek MSS. did really exist, yet both he and the elder Michaelis and Bengel agree with Griesbach in declaring them to be so completely copies of the Vulgate Latin as to be of no authority. See Marsh’s note on Michaelis, c. viii. sect. vi. c. vol. ii. no. 817, 818.

ix. 5) “dici de Eo Qui Deus ille unus sit, nullo modo posse planum est. Etenim ex eo sequeretur, unum illum Deum duos esse Deos.” Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 59. a.—“Ea est vis vocis ‘solus,’ ut omnes alios excludat a communione prædicati præter eum cui apponitur. Is autem cui vocula ‘solus’ (si sententiam spectes) . . apponitur, est Pater Jesu Christi. . . Prædicatum est ‘verus Deus,’ seu Deus summus. Quare vox ‘solus’ a communione hujus prædicati omnes excludit præter Patrem, ac porro etiam Christum et Spiritum Sanctum.” Crellius, De Uno Deo Patre, lib. I. sect. i. c. 1. § 3.

<sup>r</sup> e. g. “Cui planæ sacrarum literarum interpretationes placent, non potest non hanc, quam oppugnamus, repudiare, nostram autem amplecti, nisi opinioni de re ipsa præconceptæ omnia postponere malit.” Crell., ibid., § 25. And again, ibid., c. 3. § 47: &c.

\* 28; Rom.

BOOK II. reason concerning the truth of the matter is to be set aside; that it may be judged, without anticipation of prejudice, from evidence planted in the very words of it. And this is the answer to the rest of those texts, that have the like exclusive, but not in so strong terms as this.

[How "the Son knew not the day or hour" of the last judgment.] § 4. Now when our Lord saith, "Of that day and hour knoweth not the Son," I know St. Hilary's laboureth very eloquently to shew, that He means no more, than that He had not commission to declare it. But this would make the sense of our Lord to be the sense of those men, who, when they are asked that which they hold unfit to declare, and yet would not seem to refuse the civility of declaring it, do answer, that they know not; to wit, so as to hold it fit to be told. I will not tie myself to maintain this reservation fit for our Saviour to use: especially, where no circumstance of the case or the discourse appears to intimate such a meaning to them whom He discourseth with. When he said in the comedy, "*Tu nescis id quod scis, Dromo, si sapias*"—"If thou beest wise, thou knowest not what thou knowest<sup>b</sup>;" every man understands his meaning to be, thou wilt not declare it. Whether, when the Messiah saith, 'I know not the day of judgment,' men would conceive, that He meant no more than this, that He is not to declare it, seems to be very questionable. I can by no means comprehend, how it can be prejudicial to the faith to say, that the human soul of Christ (the knowledge whereof is necessarily limited to the capacity of a creature, and knows things above nature by voluntary revelation of the Word and Spirit, Which "knows whatsoever is in God," 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11,) should be ignorant of something that is to come<sup>c</sup>. Luke ii. 40, 52, it is said, "The Child grew and

<sup>a</sup> S. Hilar. Pictav., De Trin., lib. ix. § 58—75; Op., pp. 1022. E—1035. A: where his conclusion is in brief this, that "per id quod solus Pater sciat, Filius non intelligitur nescire, cum Filius idcirco nescire se dicat, ne et alii sciant," &c. Id., ibid., § 71; p. 1031. A.

<sup>b</sup> Terent., Heautontim., IV. iv. 26:—"si sapias." So also Eunuch., IV. iv. 55.

<sup>c</sup> "Videtur mihi, ni meliora docear, hic locus non impie posse exponi hunc in modum, ut dicamus Divinam sapi-

entiam menti humanæ Christi effectus suos impressisse pro temporum ratione. Nam quid aliud est, si verba non torquemus, 'προέκοπτε σοφία' [proficiebat sapientia], Luc. ii. 52? Sicut igitur post resurrectionem accepit omnem potestatem, ita et omnem scientiam. Ac nequis hanc sententiam ab antiquitate damnatam putet, satis admonere nos potest illud Ambrosii, 'Secundum carnem utique sapientia Dei implebatur et gratia.' Pro tempore autem ἀποστολῆς. . . . Sux Jesu opus non erat scire diem universalis judicii, quæ-



waxed strong in spirit, growing full of wisdom, and the grace of God was upon It;" and, "Jesus improved in wisdom and stature and grace with God and men." Shall I go and say, CHAP. XVII.

that He seemed thus to grow; as boys in the schools, when they cannot answer texts of Aristotle, that he speaks there in the sense of the ancient philosophers? The school doctors will have our Lord's human soul to have known all from the moment that He was conceived<sup>k</sup>, and think him not sound in the faith that doubts of it. But if only original tradition be matter of faith, according to the principle that is settled<sup>l</sup>, the meaning of particular texts of Scripture cannot be such: especially when it is evident, that such a meaning is not necessarily consequent to that which is matter of faith. And if you look but upon the sayings of the fathers that are alleged by the learned Jesuit Petavius, 2 *De Trinitate*, iii. 5—11<sup>m</sup>, you shall easily perceive how truly it is said by Leontius (*De Sectis*, p. 546<sup>n</sup>), speaking of the Agnoetæ, who were a sect of Eutychians which held that our Lord knows not all things:

"*Ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγομεν ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πᾶν ἀκριβολογεῖν περὶ τούτων τοιγαροῦν οὐδὲ ἡ σύνοδος τοιοῦτο ἐπολυπραγμόνευσε δόγμα· πλὴν ἰστέον, ὅτι οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πατέρων, σχεδὸν δὲ πάντες, λέγουσιν Αὐτὸν ἀγνοεῖν*"—"But we say, that we are not to stand stiffly upon these things; therefore neither did the

118 synod" (of Chalcedon) "trouble itself about any such position as this; yet it is to be known, that many of the fathers, even almost all, say that He was ignorant." Certainly Ire-

Deus Pater latere voluit. Nec aliter sensisse Christianorum vetustissimos indicio est Irenæus, . . . Leontius," &c. Grot., in Marc. xiii. 32.

<sup>k</sup> "Præterea sciendum est, Christum secundum hominem ab ipsa conceptione gratiæ plenitudinem recepisse, Cui Spiritus datus est non ad mensuram." P. Lomb., Sentent., lib. iii. dist. 13. A.—"Huic autem sententiæ videtur obviare, quod in Evangelio Lucæ legitur: 'Jesus proficiebat sapientia et ætate et gratia apud Deum et homines.' . . . Ad quod sane dici potest, Ipsum secundum hominem tantam a conceptione accepisse sapientiæ et gratiæ plenitudinem, ut Deus Ei plenius conferre non potnerit: et tamen vere dicitur profecisse sapientiæ et gratia, non quidem in Se, sed in aliis, qui de Ejus sapientiæ et gratia proficiebant, dum

eis sapientiæ et gratiæ munera secundum processum ætatis magis et magis patefaciebat." Id., ibid. B.—"Dicimus Animam Christi per Sapientiam Ei a Deo gratis datam in Verbo Dei, Cui unita est, Quod et perfecte intelligit, omnia scire quæ Deus scit, sed non omnia posse quæ potest Deus." Id., ibid., Dist. 14. B.

<sup>l</sup> Bk. I., Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vii., xxi., xxiv.

<sup>m</sup> Petav., *De Trin.*, lib. II. c. iii. § 5—11. (*Theol. Dogm.*, tom. ii. pp. 110—115. Paris. 1644): where a numerous catena of fathers is given, explaining Mark xiii. 32 as Thorndike has done in the text.

<sup>n</sup> Leont., *Scholæ de Sectis*, Act. x.: p. 546. ed. Leunclav. 8vo. Basil. 1578: et ap. *Biblioth. Veterum PP.*, tom. i. p. 531. B. Paris. 1624.

[“ἐπολυπραγμόνευσε,”  
[“φαίνονται λέγοντες.”]

BOOK II. *næus*<sup>o</sup> and Athanasius<sup>p</sup>, if narrowly examined, demand no more, but that He is ignorant of nothing according to His Godhead. So that it is so far from being matter of faith, that it is not in the Church ever to make it so; whatsoever the Church may do, to oblige the members of it not to declare their judgment to the scandal of others in a point so obscure.

Of that creature whereof Christ is the first-born.

[Coloss. i. 15, 16 :—  
“ἐν Αὐτῷ”  
—“by Him,”  
Eng. vers.]

§ 5. Now the words of St. Paul do manifestly distinguish between our Lord Christ and all creatures, insisting thus; “Who is the Image of the invisible God, the first-born of the whole creature; for in Him were all things created, whether in heaven or on earth.” Surely, He, “in Whom,” as by Whom, “all things” are said to have been made, is not intended to be comprised in the number of things made, by being called “the first-born of the whole creature.” And therefore I conceive the word *πρῶτος*, in the compound *πρωτότοκος*, is to signify, according to the Hebrew, not first, but before<sup>a</sup>. We have eminent examples in the Gospels. John i.

o “Scientiam diei illius Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est.” Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. ii. c. 48. p. 176. b.—“Itaque oportet agnitionem hanc Deo, quemadmodum et Dominus horæ et diei,” &c. Id., ibid., c. 49. p. 177. b.—“Et secundum agnitionem itaque præpositus esse Pater annunciat est a Domino.” Id., ibid., p. 178. a.—“Existimarunt nonnulli his verbis beatum Irenæum Christo Domino ignorantiam simpliciter tribuere. . . ‘At mihi longe aliud videtur. Qui enim fieret, ut Christo nunc ignorantiam affingeret, qui toties in superioribus Gnosticos impietatis reos agit, quod Sophiam et Monogenem Patris ignorantia passionibus subjicerent.’ . . Ergo tantum vult, Christum diei postremi notitiam, qua de agitur, ad Patrem referre, sicut opera, vitam, imo et Deitatem ipsam, ab Eodem æterna generatione accepisse palam profitetur.” Feuard., ad Iren. ii. 49.—Galladius “ad hunc Irenæi locum notavit, Christum, ut hominem, vere ignorasse diem judicii. . . Sane, licet quidam eorum quos ibidem” (Feuardius) “allegavit patrum, nullam in Christo ignorantiam admittere videantur; alii tamen talem Ei, ut homini, attribuere nihil sunt veriti.” Grabe, ad Iren. ii. 49.

<sup>p</sup> “Οἱ δὲ φιλόχριστοι καὶ χριστι-

φόροι γινώσκωμεν, ὡς οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἐστὶν, ἔλεγεν, Οὐκ οἶδα· οἶδε γὰρ· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον δεικνύς, ὅτι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἰδίον ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, καὶ ὅτι σάρκα ἀγνοοῦσαν ἐνεδύσατο, ἐν ᾧ ὦν, σαρκικῶς ἔλεγεν, Οὐκ οἶδα.” S. Athanas., Orat. iii. cont. Arian., § 45; Op., tom. i. P. i. p. 594. C, D. ed. Bened.—“Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν γινώσκων, οὐκ εἶπε φανερώς τότε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οὐδένος ἐστὶ περιεργάσασθαι, & σεσιώπηκεν Αὐτός. . . Τίνος δὲ χάριν γινώσκων ἔλεγεν, ὅτι οὐδὲ ὁ Ἰῆδς οἶδεν, οὐδένα τῶν πιστῶν ἀγνοεῖν οἶμαι, ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο οὐδὲν ἦρτον διὰ τὴν σάρκα ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔλεγεν.” Id., ibid., § 43; Op., tom. i. p. 592. B.—And see ibid., § 26. p. 576. D: and Epist. ii. ad Serapion., § 9; ibid., tom. i. P. ii. p. 689. D, E.

<sup>a</sup> “Πρῶτος, 2) pro comparativo *πρότερος*, *prior*, tempore et ordine. Joh. i. 15. 30; “Οτι πρῶτός μου ἦν”—nam prior me fuit. Luc. ii. 2; ‘Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο’—‘hæc descriptio prior erat.’ Conf. Jac. Perizonium, De Augustea Orbis Descriptione, p. 953: . . Wetstenii N. T., tom. i. p. 839: Gatackerum, De Stilo N. T., c. xxv.: et Erasmus Schmidium ad Luc. ii. 2.” Schleusn., sub voce *πρῶτος* num. 2: who gives other examples of the same signification of the word ibid. num. 4, and sub voce *πρῶτον* num. 2.



15, the Baptist saith of our Lord Christ, "ὅτι πρότός μου ἦν"—"because He was before me." Our Lord, John xv. 18; "Ἐμὲ πρότον ὑμῶν μεμίσηκεν"—"the world hated you before Me." And that endless dispute among chronologers about the words of St. Luke ii. 2, "Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου," I conceive cannot be so well composed as by translating it, "This enrolling was made before Quirinius was governor of Syria:" that is to say, before that which was made under Quirinius, who was employed divers years after, to enrol all the Jews and their goods when Archelaus was confiscated<sup>r</sup>. For Tertullian<sup>s</sup>, with whom Josephus<sup>t</sup> fully agreeth, saith expressly, that the taxation at which Christ was enrolled was made under Sentius Saturninus governor of Syria, and that the records of it were then in Rome extant when he writ. Let then "πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως" signify Him "that was brought forth before all creatures;" or let it signify by way of metonymy "the heir of all things" (as the Apostle calls our Lord Christ, Heb. i. 2, because the first-born is heir by law): and we shall not need to fear, that our Lord Christ shall become a creature by being "the first-born of the whole creature." For

<sup>r</sup> Scaliger, Casaubon, Hammond, Lardner, translate the verse, "Hic erat primus census quem agebat Quirinus, (postea) Syriæ præses:" assuming, that Quirinus was concerned in both enrolments, in the first as associated with Saturninus the then governor of Syria, in the second as governor of Syria himself. So also Hudson, ad Joseph. Ant. Jud. XVII. xv. 5 (as quoted below in note t). "Alii, ut Erasmi Schmidius, Bynæus De Nat. I. p. 329, Clericus, Perizonius in Diss. de Augustana orbis terrarum descriptione," and others, "verba vertenda esse præcipiunt, 'Hæc descriptio facta est' (np. ab Herode) 'priusquam Quirinus esset Syriæ præfectus.' Prior est actus hic census, notiore isto qui habitus est præside Syriæ Quirino Act. v. 37." Kuinoel ad Luc. ii. 2.

<sup>s</sup> "Sed et census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum, apud quos genus Ejus inquirere potuissent." Tertull., Adv. Marcion., lib. iv. c. 19; Op., p. 433. A.

<sup>t</sup> "Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελαίου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνεμηθείσης τῇ Συρίᾳ, πέμπεται Κυρήνιος ἐπὶ Καίσαρος, ἀνὴρ ὑπα-

τικός, ἀποτιμησόμενος τὰ ἐν Συρίᾳ, καὶ τὸν Ἀρχελαίου ἀποδωσόμενος οἶκον." Joseph., Ant. Jud., lib. XVII. c. xv. § 5; Op., tom. ii. p. 789.—"Bis igitur a Cæsare in Syriam (Quirinus) missus est, sed non eadem ex causa. Primæ ἀπογραφῆς (cujus meminit Lucas ii. 2) causa, ut non tam in Judæa quam in toto orbe Romano omnes describerentur, ut quot et quantos delectus ad bellum populus Romanus facere posset, . . scribi posset. Posterioris ἀπογραφῆς (cujus mentio Act. v. 37) causa intra Syriam Palestinam et unius Archelai patrimonium et tetrarchiam stetit; nec mera et nuda erat ἀπογραφὴ sed redactio bonorum Archelai in fiscum et exactio tributi super provinciales, Judæa post exsilium Archelai redacta in provinciam et Romanis præsidibus parere jussa." Huds. ad loc. Josephi.—Josephus does not mention the enrolment, of which St. Luke's Gospel speaks, but only the later one after Archelaus's banishment: to which he alludes thrice; Ant. Jud. XVII. xv. 5, as just quoted; XVIII. i. 1; and De Bell. Jud., VII. viii. 1; Op., pp. 789, 791, 1313.

BOOK  
II.

my part, I should not think I had granted any such thing, should I grant, that the word *κτίσις* here may be taken in a general sense<sup>a</sup>, to signify as well the production of God's Word as the production of His creature.

And that  
which the  
Wisdom of  
God made.

§ 6. I know how much dispute there hath been with the Arians<sup>\*</sup> about the sense of Solomon's words, Prov. viii. 22; "*Θεὸς ἔκτισέ Με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν Αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔργα Αὐτοῦ.*" Nor do I believe it can be composed by reading "*ἔκτισε*," which the sense<sup>\*</sup> seems to require. First, because it must be *ἐκτίσαστο*, not *ἔκτισε*. For it is not true, that God got Wisdom when He made the world, but was "possessed" of it. Secondly, because Wisdom, Ecclus. xxiv. [3, 8], having spoke of Her dwelling with God, as in Solomon, and His appointing Her to dwell in Israel, addeth, "*Πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέ Με καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος οὐ<sup>a</sup> μὴ ἐκλείπω*"—"before the world from the beginning He made Me<sup>b</sup>, and I fail not for everlasting:" and further, in the beginning of the chapter, according to the Latin copy<sup>c</sup>, "*Ego ex ore Altissimi prodivi, primogenita ante omnem creaturam*"—"I came out of the mouth of the Most High, the first-born before any creature." So fit to the words of St. Paul, that without doubt he had them in mind when he writ. And again, Ecclus. i. 4; "*Προτέρα<sup>d</sup> πάντων ἔκτισται Σοφία, καὶ σύνεσις φρονήσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος*"—"Wisdom was made before all things, and the understanding of prudence from everlasting:" after which there follows in

[Ecclus.  
xxiv. 9.]

[Ecclus.  
xxiv. 5.  
Vulg.]

<sup>a</sup> See Petav., De Trin., lib. II. c. i. § 5. (Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. p. 94): and below, § 7. note o.

<sup>\*</sup> See Cornelius a Lapide, Comment., ad loc., pp. 177—182. Antv. 1635.

<sup>y</sup> Two MSS. read *ἔκτισε*: and Philo Judæus (De Ebriet., Op., tom. i. p. 362), and Origen (In Matth., tom. xvii. § 14; Op., tom. iii. p. 788. C), and Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, have *ἐκτίσαστο*. See Holmes ad loc. (who retains *ἔκτισε*), and the Benedictine editors on the passage of Origen.—"Porro LXX., qui solent consentire Hebræo, nec dissentire ab Aquila, Symmacho, et Theodotione, videntur pari modo vertisse, 'Dominus *ἔκτισε*,' id est, 'possedit Me;' a *κτῶν*, id est, possideo: ut notat Bellarminus, lib. i. De Christo, c. 18. Imo S. Hieron., lib. viii. in Isaïæ c. xxvi." (Op., tom. iii. p. 221). "Unde levi mutatione

unius literæ *ε* in *ι* manavit *ἔκτισε*, id est, 'creavit Me;' a *κτίζω*, id est, condo, creō. Conjecturam hanc juvat, quod iidem LXX., Genes. iv. 1, ubi idem est verbum, 'Possedi hominem per Deum,' ipsi pro 'possedi' vertunt *ἐκτίσασα* per *η*. Jam tamen *ἔκτισε* per *ι* legunt omnes codices Græci et passim Patres: indeque tanta lis cum Arianis, qui ex hoc loco," &c. Cornel. a Lapide, ad loc.; pp. 177. D—178. A.

<sup>z</sup> Corrected from MS. "same," in orig. text.

<sup>a</sup> Corrected from MS. "*σοὺ μὴ*," in orig. text.

<sup>b</sup> Corrected from MS. "man," in orig. text.

<sup>c</sup> "*Ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος Ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ὡς ὁμίχλη κατεκάλυψα γῆν.*" Ecclus. i. 4. LXX.

<sup>d</sup> Erroneously corrected in MS. into *πρό*.



most Greek copies, "Πηγὴ Σοφίας Λόγος Θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις, CHAP. XVII.  
καὶ αἱ πορεῖαι Αὐτῆς ἐντολαὶ αἰώνιοι;" which the Vulgar

Latin rendereth, "*Fons Sapientiae Verbum Dei in excelsis, et ingressus Illius mandata aeterna;*" as if he should say, that [Ecclus. i. 5. Vulg.]

"the fountain of Wisdom is that Word which was with God in the highest, and whereby God hath made heaven and earth" (as the Psalmist saith, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of His mouth," Psalm xxxiii. 6), "and the proceedings of Wisdom are the everlasting commandments;" to wit, of the Law, whereby He instructed His people. But this, by consequence, supposing the Old Testament to be a figure of the  
119 New, must be understood of all those "ways," whereby God conversed with mankind, to preserve it from falling quite away from His truth, from the beginning, as I have shewed afore<sup>f</sup>; being nothing else but forerunners and prefaces to the coming of our Lord in the flesh: which therefore supposeth the being of this Wisdom before the world, by virtue of that which went before, where he saith, that "Wisdom was made afore all things;" and again, "Κύριος Αὐτὸς ἐκτίσεν Αὐτήν, καὶ οἶδεν καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν Αὐτήν"—"The Lord Himself made Her, and saw and numbered Her:" which though it may be understood of the wisdom "which He poured out upon His works," as straight it followeth, yet, when it is said to have been "brought forth before the world and before all things," more is said, and more must be understood.

§ 7. Now St. Athanasius against the Arians, I know, embraceth another sense of Solomon; as speaking of Christ's taking flesh to be the beginning of God's ways with man redeemed<sup>g</sup>. But I say also, that he produceth this other sense that I speak of;—that the Wisdom of God was brought forth [St. Athanasius upon Prov. viii. 22.]

\* The addition occurs in the Greek in six MSS., and in the Complutensian and Alexandrine editions; but is omitted by Holmes and Parsons in the Oxford edition of the LXX.

† ec. iii. § 4, v. § 5, xiii. § 2—6.

g "Ὅτε δὲ, εὐδοκῆσαντος τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ Λόγος Αὐτοῦ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, τότε εἰκότως εἰρηται περὶ Αὐτοῦ, παρὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἰωάννου τὸ, 'Ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο' παρὰ δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου, Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν Αὐτὸν ἐποίησε' καὶ διὰ μὲν Σολομῶνος, ὡς παρ' Αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, Κύριος ἐκτίσέ

Με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν Αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα Αὐτοῦ· παρὰ δὲ τοῦ Παύλου, Τοσοῦτω κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν Ἀγγέλων· καὶ πάλιν, 'Εαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών· καὶ αἰθις,' κ. τ. λ. "τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ πάντα ρητὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν καὶ διάνοιαν βλέπουσαν εἰς εὐσέβειαν, καὶ δεικνύουσαν τὴν Θεότητα τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ τὰ ἀνθρωπίνως λεγόμενα περὶ Αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι Αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον." S. Athanas., Orat. ii. cont. Arian., § 1; Op., tom. i. p. 469. B.

BOOK  
II.

[“ποίημα  
ἢ κτίσμα  
ᾧ,” ed.  
Bened.]

[“ἐξ ἐαυ-  
τῶν,” ed.  
Bened.]

by Him, before He made the world by His Wisdom, and that this production may be signified by the word “ἐκτισε,” though it commonly signify the production of a creature, which was not afore but “beginneth” to be in time<sup>h</sup>. The passage of Athanasius is remarkable, though upon occasion of that of the Apostle, “Πιστὸν ὄντα Τῷ ποιήσαντι Αὐτὸν” (Heb. iii. 2)—“Who was faithful to Him that made Him;” which he handleth *Orat.* ii. *contra Arian*. “Οὐ γὰρ αἱ λέξεις τὴν φύσιν παραιροῦνται, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἢ φύσιν τὰς λέξεις ἐφ’ ἐαυτὴν ἔλκουσα μεταβάλλει· καὶ γὰρ οὐ πρότεροι τῶν οὐσιῶν αἱ λέξεις, ἀλλ’ αἱ οὐσίαι πρώται, καὶ δεύτεραι τούτων αἱ λέξεις· διὸ καὶ ὅταν ἡ οὐσία ποίημα ᾦ ἢ κτίσμα, τότε τὸ ἐποίησε, καὶ τὸ ἐγένετο, καὶ τὸ ἐκτισε, κυρίως ἐπ’ αὐτῶν λέγεται [τε] καὶ σημαίνει τὸ ποίημα· ὅταν δὲ ἡ οὐσία γέννημα ᾦ καὶ Υἱός, τότε τὸ ἐποίησε, καὶ τὸ ἐγένετο, καὶ τὸ ἐκτισεν, οὐκ ἔτι κυρίως ἐπ’ Αὐτοῦ κέῖται, οὐδὲ ποίημα σημαίνει· ἀλλ’ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγέννησε, τῷ ἐποίησεν ἀδιαφόρως τις κέχρηται ῥήματι.”—“For words extinguish not the nature of things, but rather their nature draws to itself and changes the words; for words are not before things, but things are first, and after them words: therefore, when the being signified is a thing made or created, then ‘made’ and ‘became’ and ‘created’ are properly said of them” (for I read ἐπ’ αὐτῶν), “signifying a thing made; but when the being is a thing engendered, and a Son, then ‘made’ and ‘became’ and ‘created’ is not properly put upon it, nor signifies a thing made; but a man uses the word ‘made’ for ‘engendered,’ without difference<sup>i</sup>.” Which proceeding to declare by instances in the word “ἐποίησε” or “made,” he sheweth, that it may as well be said of “ἐκτισε”—“created;” which he equalleth unto it by the premises. For a little after he saith, we may understand the same, “Αὐτὸς περὶ Ἐαυτοῦ ἐὰν λέγῃ, Κύριος ἐκτισέ Με”—“If He say of Himself, The Lord created Me<sup>k</sup>;” which are the words of Solomon here questioned. And by and by; “Εἰ καὶ ποιουμένους καὶ κτιζομένους καὶ γινομένους τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν φυομένους υἱοὺς λέγοιεν οἱ γονεῖς, οὐδὲν ἡττον οὐκ ἀρνοῦνται τὴν φύσιν”—“Though

<sup>h</sup> Corrected from MS. “in him,” in orig. text.

<sup>i</sup> S. Athanas., *Orat.* ii. cont. Arian., § 3; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 471. A, B. For “ἐπ’ αὐτῶν,” several MSS., and the

editions before the Benedictine (in which editions the oration is numbered iii. instead of ii.), read “ἐπ’ αὐτῶν.”

<sup>k</sup> Id., *ibid.*, § 4; *ibid.*, p. 471. E.



parents say the sons that spring from them are made and created and come of them, nevertheless they deny not their offspring<sup>1</sup>." And again, *Orat.* iii. ; "Ταυτὸν γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ποίημα Αὐτὸν μὴ εἶναι, καὶ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα"—"For it is the same thing to say, that He is not made, and to speak of His not being a creature<sup>m</sup>." Which makes me confident, that the word *κτίσεως* in St. Paul may so be understood, without prejudice to the faith. And surely, when he saith, Gen. iv. 1, "[אֱתֵי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה]"—"I have got a man with God;" as the word is the same with that which Wisdom useth in the Hebrew, Prov. viii. 22, [יְהוָה קָנִי]<sup>n</sup>, so the sense is the same with the Greek "Κύριος ἔκτισέ Με:" for she "got a son" by bringing him forth<sup>o</sup>, which is called "*creare liberos*" in Latin, *παιδοποιεῖν* in Greek, and "to make children" in other languages. And this equivocation is very happy in our mother English, when by "getting of children" (which formally and properly signifieth the purchasing of them into the father's power as his own, which is in Greek *ἐκτησε*, in Hebrew קָנָה) it signifieth by way of metonymy the act of generation, whereby they are brought forth, which is the proper signification of the Greek word here used, "*ἐκτισε*," in the same sense with the Latin "*creare liberos*," as I said.

§ 8. I know how much dispute there is, that our Lord, [How "the Father is greater than" the Son.]  
120 when He saith, "The Father is greater than I," is to be understood of His human nature<sup>p</sup>: which to me I confess seems

<sup>1</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 472. C. "Ceteri" MSS. (three excepted), "et editio Commel., 'ἐξ αὐτῶν.'" Bened. editors, *ad loc.*

<sup>m</sup> The passage is in the same oration with those already quoted, which is *Orat.* iii. in the editions before the Benedictine, but in the Benedictine edition *Orat.* ii.: and it stands in those editions as above printed. The Benedictine editors read, "Ταυτὸν γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ποίημα καὶ κτίσμα." S. Athan., *Orat.* ii. cont. Arian., § 18; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 486. A.

<sup>n</sup> Misprinted in the orig. text.

<sup>o</sup> "Ἐκτισε non tantum significat 'creavit,' sed et 'condidit,' fecit, operatus est. Sic et Latinum 'creavit' in Script. sæpe idem est quod 'fecit.' Fecit autem vel condidit Deus Pater Filium Suum, quia Illum genuit. Sic in Script. hæc tria, creare, facere, gignere, sæpe pro eodem sumuntur: v

bum enim 'creo' amplissime sumitur. . . . Ita S. Athanas. *Serm.* iii. cont. Arian." (see above note i), "et S. Cyrill. lib. v. *Thesauri* c. 6" (*Thesaur. de Sancta et Consubstant. Trinitate*, *Assert.* xv.; *Op.*, tom. v. pp. 156. B—158. B. Paris. 1638), "qui id ipsum probant ex eo, quod Filius Dei dicatur hic creatus antequam Deus quidquam crearet et faceret, imo per Ipsum creasse omnia. Filius ergo fuit ab æterno et increatus: quare cum dicitur creatus, non aliud quam genitus significatur. Sic Latini dicunt creare et procreare liberos, pro gignere et generare. Vide nostrum Alf. Salmeronem in *Epist. S. Pauli Disp.* xxi. p. 2: ubi varia verbi 'creo' significata recenset." Corn. a Lap., *ad Prov.* viii. 22; p. 178. b. D.—See Suicer, sub voce *τίδς* III. 4. c.

<sup>p</sup> See Suicer, sub voce *τίδς* III. 4. notes t, x.

BOOK  
II.

very hard, that our Saviour should tell His disciples for their comfort, that God is greater than man, and that therefore they ought to be comforted, because He was going to God. And having always given this reason why the eternal Word of God was employed in redeeming mankind, because It came from God from everlasting; I find, that the privilege of being the fountain of the Godhead, which is of necessity proper to the Father alone, importeth that which the Son and the Holy Ghost cannot have: not as if they had not the Godhead, which is the same in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but because They have it not 'from Themselves,' and that it is necessarily more 'to give than to receive.' Whereupon it cannot be denied, that the Son and the Holy Ghost, though honoured with the titles, works, attributes, and worship of God, are nevertheless expressed and signified by the Scriptures as depending upon the Father, and as something of His, namely His Son and His Spirit, though the same God also nevertheless<sup>a</sup>. And this is without doubt the true answer to most of what Crellius brings, in the second part of his first Book *De Deo*<sup>r</sup>: that our Lord "came not from Himself," nor "to do His own will," or "to seek His own glory;" that "he that believeth in Him, believeth not in Him but in the Father that sent Him," John xii. 44; that "He was called of God as Aaron," Heb. v. 4, 5; that He received instruction from the Father; that He prays to Him; that His words and works are "not His own but His Father's;" and much more: containing one and the very same difficulty, which is assailed by saying, that wheresoever the weakness of His human nature is not signified by the importance of what is said, the rest is to be referred to the commission which He undertook to execute in our flesh, which commission supposes His coming from the Father of everlasting, as the ground and reason of His undertaking of it. This is that which the Prophet David signifieth, Psalm xl. 7—9 [Hebr.]: "Sacrifice and meat offering Thou desirest none, Mine ears hast Thou bored" (which the Apostle, Heb. x. 5, quotes thus,

[Acts xx. 35.]

[John v. 30; vi. 38; viii. 42, 50, &amp;c.]

[John v. 19, 30; viii. 28, 38; x. 18; xi. 41; xii. 27, 28; xiv. 10, 24; xv. 15; xvii. 1—8, 11, &amp;c.]

[Ps. xl. 6—8. Eng. vers.]

<sup>a</sup> See Bp. Bull, Def. Fid. Nic., Sect. IV. De Subordinationem Filii ad Patrem ut ad Sui Originem ac Principium; Works, vol. v. pp. 685 sq.

<sup>r</sup> Crell., De Uno Deo Patre, lib. i.

sect. ii. § 93—341: "In qua ostenditur Christum non esse Deum Illum Supremum, ut intelligatur solum Patrem Deum Illum Summum esse."



“A body hast Thou fitted for Me;” the taking of our flesh being His giving up of Himself for a servant to do God’s message in it, as the servant that had his ear bored was to be free no more<sup>a</sup>, Exod. xxi. 5, [6]); “Burnt offering and sacrifice for sin Thou acceptest not; then said I, lo, I come; to do Thy will, O God, written of Me in the volume of the book is My desire, yea, Thy law is within My heart.” For His freedom in undertaking this commission, as it supposeth a ground why it should be tendered, so it importeth that obedience which God rewardeth. And this is the cause why our Saviour tells His disciples, “If you loved Me, you would be glad that I go to My Father, because the Father is greater than I:” for if the commission came from Him, then is He to perform all that the execution thereof inferreth; that is, to exalt our Lord to that estate, which His disciples would be glad of, if they knew what it were.

CHAP.  
XVII.

§ 9. Nor let any man think, that there is any danger of Arius his heresy in all this. I confess the reasons I have advanced against Socinus do not formally destroy the pretence of the Arians. And the reason is, because I find that I cannot kill those two birds with one stone; nor make the reasons that I advance, to evidence the meaning of these Scriptures, which are in question, not to be that which Socinus would have, to reach so far as expressly and formally to destroy that sense which Arius pretendeth. I am confident, that [they], who will take the pains to consider that “the Word was in the beginning” when “all was made,” shall have no ground to say, that there was another beginning, before the beginning

[John xiv.  
28.]

[No danger of  
Arianism  
in interpreting  
this of  
Christ’s  
Divine nature.]

[John i.  
1, 2.]

<sup>a</sup> “Hieronymus in versione quam fecit ex LXX posuit ‘Aures autem perfecisti mihi;’ unde liquet in Græcis libris fuisse *ᾠτια* [aures]: quod et in Scholiis ad Psalmos multis annotatum est. Et sic legere in Psalmo Cyrillus inter Græcos, Arnobius minor inter Latinos; ut et alii monuere. Et hoc quidem cum Hebræo convenit. Sed pro *κατηρτισω* [aptasti] in Hebræo est *כרית* [perfodisti]; quod veterum quidam verterunt *ᾠτια δὲ ἔσκαψάς μοι* [aures autem perfodisti Mihi]: allusione non obscura ad morem illum, quo, septennio exacto, qui in servili fortuna fuerant, in posterum se volentes heris suis mancipabant (Deut. xv. 17). Voluit ergo dicere David Deo: Ita

me devinxisti beneficiis, ut in posterum semper Tuus esse velim usu ac mancipio. Sed nec *κατηρτισω* [aptasti] male hic positum, id est, ‘Aptasti me posti,’ quod fieri solitum lex illa Deuteronomii indicat. At scriptor noster pro *ᾠτια* [aures] posuit *σῶμα* [corpus]; ad quod exemplum etiam in codicibus Versionis LXX interpretum mutatio facta est, qualem et aliis locis observavimus. Fecit autem hoc ut sensum mysticum magis exprimeret: non enim in Christo auricula posti, sed Corpus totum cruci aptatum est in obedientiæ testimonium. Et auricula illa in Lege pars erat simulque signum totius corporis quod hero addicebatur.” Grot., ad Heb. x. 5.

BOOK II. of all things, when that Word was made:—that this Word  
 [John i. 1.] “was with God at the beginning,” as His bosom counsellor;  
 [John i. 1.] shall not say when God wanted His counsel:—that this  
 [John i. 3.] “Word was God;” shall not say, that any Christian is to  
 [John i. 14.] count that God which is made of nothing:—that “all things  
 were made by It;” that any thing was made by that which  
 is not God:—that the glory thereof in our flesh is “the glory  
 of the only-begotten Son of the Father;” shall make any  
 difference between the honour of the Father and the honour  
 of the Son. And so I count it enough, that the sense of the  
 Scriptures here pleaded hath in it enough to resist the  
 Arians with, though this resistance be not here expressed.<sup>121</sup>  
 But thus much is evident, that, as the Latin fathers<sup>†</sup> (espe-  
 cially since St. Augustin) have understood these words to be  
 meant of our Lord Christ according to His human nature,  
 so the Greek fathers<sup>‡</sup> have understood them to be true even  
 according to the Divine nature, upon that reason which I  
 have declared. And St. Hilary<sup>\*</sup> of the Latin Church, though

<sup>†</sup> “Duplex adversus hanc hæretico-  
 rum calumniam a Catholicis opposita  
 est loci illius” (viz. that “the Father  
 is greater than I”) “explicatio. Nam  
 alii, Christum de Seipso qua Dei Filius  
 est loqui fatentes, gradum illum majo-  
 ris ac minoris aliorum trahunt. Alii  
 ad assumptam hominis naturam refe-  
 runt. Priore modo, qui primus contra  
 Arium insurrexit eumque damnavit,  
 Alexander Alexandriae præsul intel-  
 lexit, in Epistola,” &c. “Ibi Patrem  
 dici majorem ait, quatenus ingenuus  
 est; ac sola ingenui ratione inferiorem  
 Eo esse Filium.” Petav., De Trin.,  
 lib. II. c. ii. § 2; in Theol. Dogm.,  
 tom. ii. p. 99: going on to cite (§ 2—  
 5, 8, 9. pp. 99—101, 103, 104), as  
 giving a similar interpretation to Alex-  
 ander’s, the council of Sardica, St. Atha-  
 nasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazian-  
 zen, Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, Isi-  
 dore of Pelusium, Cæsarius, St. Cyril  
 of Alexandria, St. John Damascen; to  
 whom he adds also Novatian, Marius  
 Victorinus, in some passages of his  
 writings St. Augustin himself, and  
 Faustinus. “Posterior est illorum in-  
 terpretatio qui majorem Filio Patrem  
 ideo nominari sentiunt, quia Filius  
 homine suscepto ‘minoratus est,’ non  
 a Deo solum sed etiam ‘ab Angelis;’  
 ut Apostolus ait Heb. i. Sic Athana-  
 sius, . . Basilius, . . Gregorius Nysse-

nus, . . Amphilochius, . . Cyrillus  
 (Alexandrin.), . . Hilarius, . . Scæbadius,  
 ac Faustinus, . . Ambrosius, . . et Au-  
 gustinus passim;” and from the last-  
 named the Latin fathers generally.  
 Petav., *ibid.*, § 11; *ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>\*</sup> See the last note.

<sup>‡</sup> “Si autem in ea gloria donatur Ei  
 esse qua Pater est, habes et in donan-  
 tis auctoritate quia major est,” &c.  
 S. Hilar. Pictav., De Trin., lib. ix. c.  
 54; Op., p. 1020. D, E.—“Est enim  
 Pater major Filio, sed ut pater filio;  
 generatione, non genere: filius enim  
 est, et ex Eo exivit. Et licet paternæ  
 nuncupationis proprietas differat, tamen  
 natura non differat: natus enim a Deo  
 Deus, non dissimilis est a gignente sub-  
 stantia. Non potest ergo ad Eum ex  
 Quo est exæquari. Nam quamvis alter  
 in altero per uniformem ac similem  
 ejusdem naturæ gloriam maneat; ta-  
 men et ex quo genitus est, non exæ-  
 quari in eo videtur posse quod genuit.”  
 Id., Tract. in Psalm. cxxxviii. § 17;  
 Op., p. 512. C, D.—Elsewhere (as De  
 Trin., lib. vi. § 25; Op., pp. 894. E,  
 895. A: and lib. ix. § 51; *ibid.*, p.  
 1018. C: and Fragm. xi. ex Op. His-  
 tor., § 3; *ibid.*, pp. 1354. D, 1355. A)  
 St. Hilary gives the other interpreta-  
 tion of the passage. See Petavius, De  
 Trin., lib. II. c. ii. § 8; Theol. Dogm.,  
 tom. ii. p. 103.



afore St. Augustin, expresseth the reason which I have alleged, "*ab autoritate originis*;" because the privilege of being author and original, in respect of the Son and Holy Ghost, is that which they, in respect of the Father, can have nothing to countervail.

§ 10. And this I say, because I am persuaded that it is a consideration necessary to the maintaining and evidencing of the tradition of the Church in this point. For those that understand the state of this dispute, must needs know, that the most ancient writers of the Church, Justin the Martyr<sup>y</sup>, Irenæus<sup>z</sup>, Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>a</sup>, Tertullian<sup>b</sup>, Origen<sup>c</sup>, and the rest that were before the council of Nicæa<sup>d</sup>, do speak of the Son of God as of the minister and workman to execute the counsels of God in making and governing of the world; and therefore are spoken of by very learned men of these times<sup>e</sup>, enemies enough to those heresies, as men to be suspected in the sincerity of the Christian faith. A thing not to be marvelled at, in those that believe the express act and decree of the present Church to be the reason and ground of believing<sup>f</sup>. For, upon that account, what hinders that to

CHAP.  
XVII.

That this belief [respecting the Divinity of the Father and of Christ] is the original tradition of the Church.

<sup>y</sup> "Θεός . . . ὑπηρέτης ὡν τοῦ Ποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων Θεοῦ." Just. Mart., Dial. cum Tryph., c. lvii.: Op., p. 154. D. See Bp. Bull, Defens. Fid. Nic., Sect. II. c. iv. § 7; Works, vol. v. pp. 191, 192: and Sect. IV. c. ii. § 2; *ibid.*, pp. 705—708: and Petav., De Trin., lib. II. c. vii. § 7—9; Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. pp. 140—142.

<sup>z</sup> "Ministrat enim Ei ad omnia Sua Progenies et Figuratio Sua, id est, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, Verbum et Sapientia." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. iv. c. 17. p. 304. b. And elsewhere. See Bull, *ibid.*, Sect. II. c. v. § 7; *ibid.*, pp. 224—226.

<sup>a</sup> "Ἔστιν ὡς εἰπεῖν Πατρική τις Ἑνέργεια ὁ Υἱός." S. Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. vii. c. 2; Op., tom. ii. p. 833.

<sup>b</sup> "Christus Dominus, Qui ab initio vicarius Patris in Dei nomine et auditus sit et visus." Tertull., Adv. Marc., lib. iii. c. 6; Op., p. 400. A.—"Exinde autem in sermone Christo assistente et administrante Deus voluerit fieri, et Deus fecit." Id., Adv. Prax., c. xli.; Op., p. 506. D.

<sup>c</sup> "Τὸν μὲν προσεχῶς δημιουργὸν εἶναι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, καὶ ὡς περὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν τοῦ κόσμου τὸν δὲ Πατέρα τοῦ Λόγου, τῷ προστεταχέναι

τῷ Υἱῷ ἑαυτοῦ Λόγῳ ποιῆσαι τὸν κόσμον, εἶναι πρῶτως δημιουργόν." Origen., Cont. Cels., lib. vi. c. 60; Op., tom. i. p. 678. D. E. See Bp. Bull as before quoted, Sect. II. c. ix. § 10; *ibid.*, pp. 305, 306.

<sup>d</sup> "Exorsus igitur Deus fabricam mundi, Illum primum et maximum Filium præfecit operi universo, Eoque simul et consiliatore usus est et artifices in excogitandis, ornandis, perficiendis-que rebus." Lactant., Instit. Div., lib. ii. De Origine Erroris, c. 8. pp. 153, 154. ed. Spark. Oxon. 1684.—"Τοῦτον τὸν Λόγον ἔσχεν ὑπουργὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένων." Theophil. Antioch., Ad Autol., lib. ii. c. 14. p. 118.—&c.

<sup>e</sup> Scil. Petavius, De Trin., lib. I. c. v. § 7; Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. pp. 29, 30. And so also Episcopus, and Zuickerus: see Bp. Bull, Def. Fid. Nic., Proæm., § 5—8; Works, vol. v. pp. 6—13. So also Card. du Perron: see below, note l. And see Newman, Arians of 4th Cent., c. ii. sect. 4. pp. 195—217; and (perhaps it is hardly necessary to add) Essay on Development, Introd., pp. 11—17. 2nd. edition.

<sup>f</sup> See Bp. Bull as quoted in note c, § 8. pp. 12, 13: and below, § 19.

BOOK  
II.

become matter of faith, being decreed by those which are enabled on behalf of the Church, which was not matter of faith an hour before? But those that draw the reason why they believe, from the evidence which the society and communion of the Church tenders<sup>s</sup> to common sense, that nothing could be refused by the whole body thereof but that which appeared to all contrary to that which all have received from the beginning, will count it a violent abuse to all reason to make the Christian faith larger in the stream than it was in the fountain. And therefore, though the terms of the Scripture, agreeing with those which the most ancient fathers of the Church use, may justly authorize and bring into use those expressions which have not been usual, upon a due understanding of the intent to which they are used; yet is there no power in the Church, to render those terms, which have passed for Christian and Catholic in the primitive times of the Church, suspected of heresy in these times.

[No need here to clear Origen in this matter.]

§ 11. Origen is strongly charged by the ancient times, in particular by Epiphanius<sup>h</sup>, as the seminary of the Arians. And that the Arians might not have advantage by many of his sayings, were too much to undertake, and that which my business no way requires. The Socinians have made their advantages of Erasmus his writings<sup>i</sup>. And is any man so silly as to imagine that Erasmus was therefore of Socinus his faith? Have they not made the like use of Maldonate<sup>k</sup>, and his commentaries upon the Gospels? And is there any appearance, that his meaning should be that of Socinus?

[Cardinal du Perron.]

§ 12. I will not therefore deny, that the Cardinal du Perron, in his answer to King James (p. 633<sup>l</sup>), does acknow-

<sup>s</sup> Corrected from MS. "tender," in orig. text.

<sup>h</sup> "Ὅποτε δὲ ἐν πολλοῖς τόποις εὐρομεν αὐτὸν" (viz. Origen) "τὸν μονογενῆ Θεὸν ἀπαλλοτριῶντα τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς Θεότητος τε καὶ Οὐσίας, ὁμοῦ τε καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τοῦτον χάριν τὸ γεννητὸν Θεὸν εἰρηκέναι αὐτὸν σαφές ἐστίν, ὅτι κτιστὸν ὀρίζεται." Epiphani., Adv. Hær., lib. ii. tom. i. Hær. 64. § 8; Op., tom. i. p. 531. D.—"φάσκει γὰρ αὐτός" (Origen), "τολμήσας δῆθεν κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν λέγειν, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ὁ Τίος ὁ μονογενὴς δρᾶν τὸν Πατέρα οὐ δύναται," κ.τ.λ. "Καὶ αὕτη πρώτη αὐτοῦ ἡ πτώσις. Ἐκ γὰρ τῆς Οὐσίας τοῦ

Πατρὸς τοῦτον εἰσηγεῖται, κτιστὸν δὲ ἄμα. Βούλεται δὲ ὡς κατὰ χάριν τὸν Τίον Αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι λέγειν." Id., ibid., § 4; ibid., p. 527. C.—See Huet., Origeniana, lib. II. Qu. ii. § 7.

<sup>i</sup> See e. g. above, c. xiv. § 7. note u; and c. xviii. § 31: and Catech. Racov., sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 69; sect. vi. De Bapt. Aquæ, c. 3. p. 119; De Prom. Spiritus S., c. 6. p. 138. &c.

<sup>k</sup> See e. g. the quotations in Botsac, Anti-Crell. (as cited below, note n), lib. III. sect. vi. c. 1. § 2. pp. 792, 793.

<sup>l</sup> "Et pour ce qui demandera a un Arien, . . s'il veut se sousmettre au jugement de l'Eglise des siecles prece-



ledge, that Arius were able to maintain himself within compass of tradition, were he to be tried by the fathers before the council of Nicæa. But I give the reader notice, that this is the consequence and the interest of that position, which deriveth tradition of faith from an express act of the present Church, supposing the matter of it not to have been of force, and effectually acknowledged, in all ages of the Church. Which if it were true in this case, then could no man be obliged to believe the Trinity as matter of faith: though it might remain questionable, whether or no a man may be obliged to conform to it, as consistent with the faith, and not to scandalize the unity of the Church, by rejecting the act and decree of it; according to the position settled in the first Book<sup>m</sup>.

§ 13. I will further acknowledge, that I have seen an answer to Crellius the Socinian's book *De Deo* by one Botsaccus<sup>n</sup> (now of Danzick, I take it): in the end whereof I find a number of exceptions made by the Socinians, in their 122 writings which I have not seen, against the faith of all that writ before Constantine in particular, as inconsistent with that of Nicæa; the particulars whereof, because I have not seen the books, and therefore cannot presume to answer particularly, I could not here repeat, would the model of my book give leave. In general: whosoever will take the pains to peruse that which is there alleged, shall perceive: first,\*

[Socinian exceptions to the traditions of the early Church answered in general.]

dens celui de Constantin, . . il n'en fera aucune difficulté, ains pressera luy-mesme que la controverse se decide par ce peu qui nous reste d'auteurs de ce temps-la. Car l'Arien trouvera dans Sainct Irenée, Tertullian, et autres qui nous sont restez en petit nombre de ces siecles-la, que le Fils est l'instrument du Pere; que le Pere a commandé au Fils lors qu'il a esté question de la creation des choses; que le Pere et le Fils sont 'aliud et aliud:' choses, que qui tiendroient aujourd'hui que le langage de l'Eglise est plus examiné, seroit estimé pour Arien luy-mesme." Card. du Perron, Repl. a la Responce du Roy de la Grande Bretagne, liv. II. Observ. iv. c. v. p. 729. fol. Paris. 1620. It does not appear from what edition Thorndike quotes.

<sup>m</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxiv. § 7. And see below, § 19.

<sup>n</sup> Anti-Crellius; hoc est, Johannis

Crellii Franci De Uno Deo Patre libb. duorum Confutatio: &c. &c. opera Johannis Botsacci, S. Literarum D. Profess. et Rectoris Gymnasii Dantiscani. Gedan. 4to. 1642. In lib. III. sect. vi. c. 1. § 1—3. pp. 788—791 (the heading of the chapter being, "De Trinitate a Patribus et Ecclesiæ Orthodoxæ Doctoribus usque ad tempora Concilii Nicæni asserta"), quotations are given from Socinian writers, to the purpose above-mentioned, respecting the evidence for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in the ante-Nicene fathers: while in the following paragraphs and chapters (pp. 794—853) their arguments from particular fathers are refuted. Botsac was from Erfurdt; and had published some works at Wittenberg before his removal to Dantzic.—See Bp. Bull, Def. Fid. Nic., Proæm., § 4; Works, vol. v. pp. 5, 6.

**BOOK II.** that those who allege them fall out among themselves perpetually, sometimes and for some sayings challenging Tertullian for example, or Clemens, or Origen, for one of them that believe not the Trinity, otherwise disowning them as those that helped to introduce the faith of it<sup>o</sup>; but no where remembering themselves concerned to make good that which they maintain out of the words of Hegesippus in Eusebius<sup>p</sup>, that the faith of the whole Church was deflowered presently upon the death of the Apostles, and to shew, that such a change did indeed come to pass in the faith of the Holy Trinity: secondly, that there is no more difficulty in reducing the sense of their sayings there questioned to the sense of the Church after the council of Nicæa, than in reducing the sense of Athanasius<sup>q</sup>, when he alloweth that “Θεὸς ἐκτισέ Με” may be understood of the proceeding of the Son from the Father of everlasting; or the sense of all those<sup>r</sup> fathers<sup>s</sup>, that understand “the Father is greater than I,” of the privilege of the original and author, which the Father of necessity hath personally above the Son and the Holy Ghost, the God-head being one and the same; to the same sense.

[Tertul-  
lian.]

[Prov. viii.  
22.]

§ 14. One passage of Tertullian I have thought worth the clearing; because it seems to contain a remarkable conceit of his, in expounding the words of Solomon in the Greek, “Θεὸς ἐκτισέ Με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν Αὐτοῦ,” to the sense of the Church, so many years before Arius built his heresy in a manner upon it. The words are in his book *Contra Hermo-*

<sup>o</sup> “Tertullianus dicit Credo Spiritum Sanctum, non Credo in Spiritum Sanctum: Socinus (p. 298. Def. Animadv.). Ergo non docuit Spiritus Sancti personalitatem:” but, “Tertullianum . . . Smalcus de Incarnati Verbi natura rejicit, ut ‘inepte et pueriliter’ locum Joh. xvii. explicantem.” Botsac., *ibid.*, c. 4. § 8. p. 820.—“Dicit Origenes, Patrem esse majorem Sermone quodam. Sic olim Socinianus in Catechismo.” But, “Sibi contradicunt Sociniani. Nam Sommerus (p. 17. b. contra Carolium et p. 20) fatetur, tempora Origenis jam tum habuisse initia Trinitatis. Imo F. Davidis Origenem in censum corruptorum vitiatorumque autorum retulit (p. 144. contra Major.). Hoc aut verum est, et sic frustra objicitur Origenes; vel falsum est, et sic mendax erit Sommerus, falsus erit

F. David.” *Id.*, *ibid.*, c. 5. § 9; pp. 836, 837.—“Negat Socinus (p. 309 Defens. Animadv.) Justinum nobiscum sensisse, quod ex ejusdem Dialogo contra Tryphonem planum fieri dicit, adeoque contradicit Simoni Budnæo, qui dogma Trinitatis inventum Justini esse confirmat.” *Id.*, *ibid.*, c. 1. § 12; p. 803, &c.—See Catech. Racov., Sect. iv. De Persona Christi, c. 1. p. 78.

<sup>p</sup> “Objicitur” (a Socinians); “Ecclesia diu non mansit virgo.” Egesipp. apud Euseb. iv. 21. Itaque sana de Deo doctrina mox a tempore Apostolorum adulterata est. Theodos. Schimberg. p. 26. Præfat. in libr. Sommeri.” Botsac., *ibid.*, c. 1. § 1. p. 701.

<sup>q</sup> See above, § 7.

<sup>r</sup> Corrected from MS. “these,” in orig. text.

<sup>s</sup> See above, § 9. notes t, x.



genem, cap. iii.<sup>4</sup>: “*Quia et Pater Deus est, et judex Deus est, non tamen ideo Pater semper, et judex semper, quia Deus semper: nam nec Pater potuit esse ante Filium, nec judex ante delictum; fuit autem tempus, cum et delictum et Filius non fuit, quod judicem et Qui Patrem Dominum faceret*”—“For God also is Father, and God is judge, and yet not always Father and judge because always God: for neither could He be Father before a Son, nor judge before sin; but there was a time, when neither sin was to make God a judge, nor Son to make God a Father.” He that reads this only, would think at a blush, that it is the very mark of Arius his heresy: “*Ἦν ὅταν οὐκ ᾔν*”—“There was a time when the Son was not.” But the answer is in his book *Contra Praxeam*, cap. v.<sup>x</sup>: “*Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, Ipse Sibi et mundus et locus et omnia: solus autem, quia nihil aliud extrinsecus præter Illum. Cæterum ne tunc quidem solus; habebat enim Secum Quam habebat in Semetipso; Rationem Suam scilicet: rationalis enim Deus, et Ratio in Ipso prius, et ita in Ipso omnia. Quæ Ratio sensus Ipsius est. Hanc Græci Λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo sermonem etiam appellamus. Ideoque [jam] in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis, Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse: cum magis Rationem competat antiquiorem haberi, quia non sermonalis a principio, sed rationalis Deus etiam ante principium; et quia ipse quoque sermo ratione consistens, priorem eam ut substantiam suam ostendat. Tamen et sic nihil interest. Nam etsi Deus nondum Sermonem Suum miserat, proinde Eum cum Ipsa et in Ipsa Ratione intra Semetipsum habebat, tacite cogitando et disputando Secum, quæ per Sermonem mox erat dicturus. Cum ratione enim Sua cogitans atque disponens, Sermonem Eam efficiebat, Quam Sermone tractabat*.”—“For, before all things, God was alone, to Himself both world and place and all: but alone, because without there was nothing besides Him. Otherwise even then not alone. For He had with Him that which He had in Him, His Reason forsooth. For God is reasonable,

CHAP.  
XVII.[“Pater et  
judex.”  
Rigalt.  
Pamel.][“etiam  
Deus,” Ri-  
galt... “ita  
ab Ipso,”  
Rigalt. Pa-  
mel.][“dispo-  
nendo,”  
Rigalt. Pa-  
mel.]

<sup>4</sup> Tertull., Cont. Hermog., c. lii.; Op., p. 234. B, C.

<sup>x</sup> “φησιν” (scil. Arius), “εἰ δὲ Πα-  
τὴρ ἐγέννησε τὸν Υἱόν, ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως  
ἔχει ὁ γεννηθεὶς καὶ ἐκ τούτου δῆλον,  
ὅτι ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ᾔν ἁπολουθεὶ τε

ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἐξ οὐκ ὕψτων ἔχειν Αὐτὸν  
τὴν ὑπόστασιν.” Socrat., H. E., lib. i.  
c. 5. p. 9. B, C. And Sozom., H. E.,  
lib. i. c. 15. p. 426. B. &c.

<sup>x</sup> Tertull., Cont. Prax., c. v.; Op.,  
pp. 509 D. 503. A.

BOOK  
II.

and Reason was in Him before, and so all things. This Reason is His sense. This the Greek calls *Λόγος*, by which name also we call speech. Therefore our people use, for one translation, to say, that Speech was in the beginning with God: whereas it is more pertinent, that Reason should be counted more ancient, because God spoke it [not] from the beginning, but had Reason even before the beginning; and because speech itself, standing upon reason, shews it to be the former, as that whereupon it standeth. But even<sup>123</sup> so it matters not. For though God had not yet sent forth His Speech, He had it no less within Himself, with and within His very Reason, silently thinking and disposing<sup>7</sup> with Himself those things, which He was to utter by speech. [For thinking with His Reason, and disposing, He made it speech, which by speech He treated<sup>2</sup>.]” Further, cap. vi., vii.<sup>a</sup>: “*Nam ut primum Deus voluit ea quæ cum Sophiæ ratione et sermone disposuerat intra Se, in substantias et species suas* [“in Se,” Rigalt. Pamel.] *edere, ipsum primum protulit Sermonem, habentem intra Se individuas suas, rationem et sapientiam, ut per Ipsum fierent un-* [“rationem et sophiam,” Rigalt. Pamel.] *versa, per Quem erant cogitata et disposita, imo et facta jam quantum in Dei sensu. Hoc enim eis deerat, ut coram quoque in suis speciebus et substantiis cognoscerentur, et tenerentur.* [Gen. i. 3.] *Tunc igitur etiam Ipse Sermo speciem et ornatum Suum sumit, sonum et vocem, cum dicit Deus, ‘Fiat Lux.’ Hæc est nativitas perfecta Sermonis, dum ex Deo procedit: conditus ab eo pri-* [Prov. viii. 22.]  *mum ad cogitatum, in nomine Sophiæ (‘Dominus condidit Me initium viarum’); dehinc generatus ad effectum (‘cum pararet cælum, aderam Ei simul’); exinde Eum Patrem Sibi faciens, de Quo procedendo Filius factus est; primogenitus, ut ante omnia* [Prov. viii. 27.] *genitus; et unigenitus, ut solus ex Deo genitus; proprie de vulva cordis Ipsius, secundum quod et Pater Ipse testatur,* [“parem Sibi,” Rigalt. Pamel.] *‘Eructavit cor Meum sermonem optimum.’ Ad Quem deinceps* [Ps. xlv. 1.] *gaudens, proinde gaudentem in persona Illius, ‘Filius Meus es* [Ps. ii. 7.] *Tu, Ego hodie genui Te,’ et, ‘Ante Luciferum genui Te.’ Sic et* [Ps. cix. 3.] *Filius ex Sua persona profitetur Patrem in nomine Sophiæ, ‘Do-* [Vulg.] *minus condidit Me initium viarum in opera Sua.’*” —“For as

<sup>7</sup> Corrected into “disputing,” in MS.; owing to a mistake (corrected above in the margin) in quoting the original Latin.

<sup>2</sup> The last sentence, “For thinking

... treated,” which is necessary to complete the translation of the passage, is added from the MS.

<sup>a</sup> Tertull., Cont. Prax., cc. vi., vii.; Op., p. 503. C, D.



soon as God pleased to put forth into their own substances and kinds those things, which He had ordered within Himself with the reason and speech of wisdom, the first He brought forth was Speech, having in it reason and wisdom, from which it is unseparable, that all things might be made by that, whereby they had been devised and disposed, nay made already as to the sense of God. For they wanted only this, to be known and had in their own kinds and substances. Then therefore even God's Speech itself assumed His own kind, and dress, sound, and voice, when God said, 'Let there be light.' This is the perfect birth of Speech, as it proceedeth from God: first made by Him for a thought devised by Him under the name of Wisdom ('the Lord made Me the beginning of His ways'); then engendered to effect ('I was together with Him when He prepared the heavens'); thenceforth making Him His Father" (for I read "*Patrem Sibi faciens*," not "*pacem*<sup>b</sup>," as I find it printed<sup>c</sup>), "by proceeding from Whom He became a Son (firstborn, as born before all things; and only, as alone engendered by God), from the proper womb of His heart; according as the Father Himself also witnesseth, 'My heart hath uttered an excellent speech.' To Whom rejoicing according as He rejoiceth, in the Father's person He saith, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' and, 'Before the morning star have I engendered Thee.' As the Son also, in His person, professeth the Father under the name of Wisdom; 'The Lord made Me the beginning of ways unto His works.' " All this, if it be understood as becometh God, will contain nothing prejudicial to the faith of God's Church (whether it contain the true sense of the Scriptures or not): though "sound" and "voice" and "speech," and "thought" or "device," if they be understood as they signify in God's creatures, are inconsistent with His excellence. But so far it will be from Arius his heresy, as to answer the very ground of it; by saying that the "Word," or "Reason," or "Wisdom" of God (Which, incarnate, is our Lord Christ), was from everlasting in God, but not under the notion, quality, or attribute of Son, till the making of the

CHAP.  
XVII.

[Gen. i. 3.]

[Prov. viii. 22.]

[Prov. viii. 27.]

[Ps. xlv. 1.]

[Ps. iii. 7.]

[Ps. cix. 3. Vulg.]

[Prov. viii. 22.]

<sup>b</sup> Rhenanus (Basil. 1521), Pamelius, and Rie  
in thi

<sup>c</sup> Corrected from MS. "promised,"  
"parem" in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

[“accedentia.”]

world; and that, as Tertullian said in the place from whence the objection is quoted, “*accidentis rei mentio*”—“the mention of an accessory,” to wit, the declaration of God’s will to make the world, gave Him the denomination of Son, which He bore not afore<sup>d</sup>, according to Tertullian (whether he hit the true sense of the Scripture in it, or only endeavour so to do), though always the same from everlasting.

[“dirigens”]  
[“nec substantia”]

§ 15. The answer to this difficult passage of Tertullian may serve for another; *Contra Praxeam*, cap. ii.: “*Unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si Ipsum eundemque et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum dicat: quasi non sic quoque unus sit omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per substantiæ scilicet unitatem; et nihilominus custodiatur æconomix sacramentum, quæ Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit, tres dividens, Patrem, [et] Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum: Tres autem, non statu sed gradu, non substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie; unius autem status, et*<sup>124</sup> *unius substantiæ, et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex Quo et gradus isti, et formæ, et species, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, deputantur*”—“He thinks he is not otherwise to believe one God, than saying, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are all one: as if one were not all as well, if all proceed from one; by unity of substance, forsooth: preserving nevertheless the mystery of that distribution, which disposeth the Unity into a Trinity, ordering three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but not Three for state but for rank, not for substance but for form, not for power but for specialty; but of one state, one substance, one power, because one God, from whom those ranks, and forms, and specialties, are understood<sup>f</sup>.” These words, “*non statu sed gradu,*” &c., both Cardinal Bellarmine<sup>g</sup>, and

<sup>d</sup> “Dei nomen dicimus semper fuisse apud Semetipsum, et in Semetipso, Dominum vero non semper. Diversa enim utriusque conditio. Deus substantiæ ipsius nomen, id est, Divinitatis; Dominus vero non substantiæ, sed potestatis. Substantiam semper fuisse cum suo nomine, quod est Deus: postea Dominus, accedentis scilicet rei mentio. Nam ex quo esse cœperunt in quæ potestas Domini ageret, ex illo per accessionem potestatis et factus et dictus est Dominus: quia et pater Deus est et iudex Deus est; non tamen ideo pater et iudex

semper,” &c. Tertull., *Adv. Hermog.*, c. iii.; *Op.*, p. 234. B.

<sup>e</sup> Misprinted 118 in the folio edition.

<sup>f</sup> Tertull., *Adv. Prax.*, c. ii.; *Op.*, p. 501. C.

<sup>g</sup> “Henricum Bullingerum Zuinglii successorem non puidit scribere, in *Libro de Scripturæ et Ecclesiæ Auctoritate*, tres esse in Divinitate Personas, non statu sed gradu, non subsistentia sed forma, non potestate sed specie differentes. Certe Personas Divinas, gradu, forma, et specie esse differentes, vix Ariani ipsi dicere ausi essent.” Bel-



Valentia<sup>h</sup>, meeting in a passage of Bullinger<sup>l</sup>, not naming his author, have charged with Arianism; being indeed Tertullian's words, manifestly expressing the Unity of the Godhead, the substance, state, and power of It in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by Their personal properties, characters, or notions, in the terms of "*gradus, formæ, et species*"—"ranks, forms, and specialties," no other being then in use.

§ 16. In like sort Ignatius, according to the true copies, saith, "*Ὁ Θεὸς ἐκνοφορήθη*"—"God was born;" *Epist. ad Ephes.*<sup>k</sup> He calls Him there "Son of God and Son of Man," "*Θεὸν ἀνθρωπίνως φανερούμενον*"—"God manifest as man<sup>l</sup>." He calls Him "*Λόγον ἀίδιον οὐκ ἀπὸ συγῆς προελθόντα*"—"The eternal Word that came not forth from silence;" *Epist. ad Magnes.*<sup>m</sup> Athanasius, *De Synodis*<sup>n</sup>, quotes out of him; "We have one Physician, bodily and incorporeal, engendered and not engendered, God in man." Justin calleth Him "the Word of God, indistinct from Him in virtue and power, and incarnate<sup>o</sup>." He makes Him "the Lord of hosts, and the King of Glory<sup>p</sup>." He expresseth His procession by "light

CHAP.  
XVII.

[St. Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Clemens, Origen, use words unques- tionable.]

larm., De Christo, Præfat.; Controv., tom. i. p. 269.

<sup>h</sup> "Item Bullingerus, sacramentarius, tres in Divinitate Personas differre dicit, 'non statu sed gradu, non subsistentia sed forma, non potestate sed specie,' Quibus verbis non solum Filii Divinitatem sed totum sanctissime Trinitatis mysterium evertit." Greg. de Valentia, de Rebus Fidei hoc tempore Controversis Libri &c., De Sanct. Trin., lib. i. c. ix.; p. 116. F. fol. Lugd. 1591.

<sup>l</sup> "Custodientes ergo patres ecclesiastici, docentesque *oikonomias* sacramentum, quæ Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit, Tres dirigens, Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, Tres utique confitens, non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, unius autem substantiæ, et unius status, et unius potestatis, quia Deus unus, ex Quo et gradus isti et formæ et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur, dixerunt unam esse Dei essentiam et tres distinctas Personas, vel unam usiam, tres hypostases. Quid vero hic aberrarunt a verbo Dei? Unde hæc nisi ex Scriptura acceperunt?" Bullinger., Ad Joannis Cochlei de Canonica Scrip-

turæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ autoritate libellum Responsio &c., c. vii. p. 16. b. 4to. Tigur. 1544. At the end of the chapter (p. 18<sup>a</sup>) is a general reference to Tertullian contra Praxeam.

<sup>k</sup> S. Ignat., *Epist. ad Ephes.*, c. xviii. p. 288. ed. Jacobson.

<sup>l</sup> Id., *ibid.*, c. xix. p. 292.

<sup>m</sup> Id., *Epist. ad Magnes.*, c. viii. pp. 210, 212.—a disputed passage.

<sup>n</sup> "Ἰγνάτιος οὖν, ὁ μετὰ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατασταθὲς ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ μάρτυς τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενόμενος, γράφων περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, εἰρηκεν· Εἰς ἱατρός ἐστι, σαρκικὸς καὶ πνευματικὸς, γενητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν Ἀνθρώπῳ Θεὸς, ἐν θανάτῳ ζῶν ἀληθινῇ, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ." S. Athan., *De Synodis Arimin. et Seleuc.*, c. 47; *Op.*, tom. i. P. ii. p. 761. A, B: from S. Ignat., *Epist. ad Ephes.*, c. vii. pp. 272, 274. ed. Jacobson.

<sup>o</sup> "Τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων Λόγος ἀχώριστος δυνάμει, τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ πλασθέντα ἀναλαβὼν ἄνθρωπον." S. Justin. Mart., *Ad Græcos Cohort.*, c. 38; *Op.*, p. 34. E.

<sup>p</sup> "Δοξάζομεν Ἀντὸν" (τὸν Θεόν) "διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς δόξης, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων." Id., *Dial. cum Tryph.*, c. 29; *ibid.*, p. 126. E.

BOOK  
II.

kindled from light, and fire from fire<sup>q</sup>." Irenæus expressly maintaineth Him "one and the same God with the Father," and "true God," and "His generation ineffable, without beginning and from everlasting<sup>r</sup>." Clemens makes Him "God equal to God, as His Son<sup>s</sup>." Origen, not in any work now extant, that may be questioned, but as he is alleged by Athanasius, *De Decretis Synodi Nicenæ*<sup>t</sup>, says of Him, that "if there be any Image of God Who is invisible, that Image must also be invisible;" with a great deal more to the same purpose: where he also quotes Theognostus *in secundo Hypotuposeon*<sup>u</sup>, affirming the same at large. To set aside those that are questioned. And shall we not think ourselves obliged so to

<sup>q</sup> "Ὅποιον ἐπὶ πυρὸς δρῶμεν ἄλλο γινόμενον, οὐκ ἐλαττωμένου ἐκείνου ἐξ οὗ ἡ ἑναυσις γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μένοντος, καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναφθὲν καὶ αὐτὸ δὴ φαίνεται, οὐκ ἐλαττώσαν ἐκείνο ἐξ οὗ ἀνήφθη." S. Just. M., *ibid.*, c. 61; *ibid.*, p. 158. A. B.—"Ὅθω τολυννοοῦμεν τὸν Τῖδιν ἐκ Πατρὸς γεγενῆσθαι, ὡς φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς ἐκλάμψαν." Expos. Rectæ Confess., c. 9; in Append. ad Op. S. Justin. Mart., p. 426. C.—"Ὡς περ γὰρ ἀπὸ μίας δαδὸς ἀνάπτεται μὲν πυρὰ πολλὰ, τῆς δὲ πρώτης δαδὸς διὰ τὴν ἑξαψιν τῶν πολλῶν δαδῶν οὐκ ἐλαττοῦται τὸ φῶς· οὕτω καὶ ὁ Λόγος, προελθὼν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἕλογον πεποίηκε τὸν γεγεννηκότα." Tatian., Cont. Græc. Orat., c. 5; ap. Op. S. Just. Mart., p. 248. A.

<sup>r</sup> E. g. "Bene igitur dixit, 'principio erat Verbum;' . . . et 'Deus erat Verbum' consequenter; quod enim ex Deo natum est, Deus est." Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 1. § 18. p. 39.—"Generationem Ejus inenarrabilem." Id., *ibid.*, lib. ii. c. 48. p. 176. b.—"Hæc est synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius, Ipse per Semetipsum collegit. De Quo iterum dicit, 'Deus Deorum Dominus loquutus est, et vocavit terram.' Quis Deus? De Quo dixit, 'Deus manifeste veniet, Deus noster, et non silebit;' hoc est, Filius, Qui secundum manifestationem hominibus advenit, Qui dicit, 'Palam apparui his qui Me non quærent.'" Id., *ibid.*, lib. iii. c. 6. p. 208. b.—So also *ibid.*, c. 23. p. 252. b; and lib. v. c. 17. p. 426.—"Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre vivorum est Deus, Qui locutus est Moysi, Qui et Patribus manifestatus est." Id., *ibid.*, lib. iv. c. 11. p. 282. b.—Thorndike seems also to

allude to lib. iii. c. 9. pp. 212, 213 (of which the conclusion runs thus; "Unus igitur et idem Deus, Qui a prophetis prædicatus est et ab Angelo annunciat, et Hujus Filius, Qui ex fructu ventris David, id est ex David Virgine, et Emmanuel, Cujus et stellam Balaam quidam sic prophetavit, 'Orietur stella,'" &c.): which however is not wholly to his purpose.

<sup>s</sup> "Εοικεν δὲ ὁ Παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ παῖδες ὑμεῖς, τῷ Πατρὶ Αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, Ὅς περ ἐστὶν Τῖδς, ἀναμάρτητος, ἀνεπίληπτος, καὶ ἀπαθὴς τὴν ψυχὴν· Θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπου σχήματι ἀχραντος, Πατρικῷ θελήματι διάκονος, Λόγος Θεός, ὁ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ὁ ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, σὺν καὶ τῷ σχήματι Θεός." S. Clement. Alex., *Pædagog.*, lib. i. c. 2; Op., tom. i. p. 99.

<sup>t</sup> "Λέγων οὕτως· Εἰ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, ἀόρατος εἰκὼν." S. Athan., *De Decret. Nicæn. Synod.*, c. 27; Op., tom. i. P. i. p. 233. A: quoting Origen.

<sup>u</sup> "Γράφων γὰρ περὶ Τίου ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων (Θεόγνωστος), οὕτως εἴρηκεν· Οὐκ ἐξωθέν τις ἐστὶν ἐφευρεθείσα ἡ τοῦ Τίου οὐσία, οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐπεισέχθη· ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας ἔφυ, ὡς τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, ὡς ὕδατος ἀτμός· οὕτε γὰρ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, οὕτε ἡ ἀτμός, αὐτὸ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστὶν, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος· οὕτε ἀλλότριον, ἀλλὰ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας, οὐ μερισμὸν ὑπομενείας τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας· ὡς γὰρ μένων ὁ ἥλιος δ' αὐτὸς οὐ μειοῦται ταῖς ἐκχεομέναις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ αἰγαῖς, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀλλοίωσιν ὑπέμεινεν, εἰκόνα ἑαυτῆς ἐχουσα τὸν Τῖδιν." S. Athan., *ibid.*, c. 26; *ibid.*, p. 230. B. C.



understand their words, which the importunity of heresies have made questionable, that they may consist and agree with those which remain unquestionable? Especially, all of them agreeing in this, that the world was made and is governed by Christ; and that the whole dispensation of God tending to the salvation of mankind, whether before the Law or under the Law, as well as since His appearing in the flesh, was executed by Him, as a preface and prologue to His coming in the flesh (a supposition which all seem to ground themselves upon, especially against the Jews, in giving account of our common Christianity<sup>\*</sup>); that our faith is in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that we are to glorify, to worship, and to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and in counting all heretics, that denied it. For communion with the Church (not communicating with those who believe it not, because they believe it not) is an evidence, which no words of doubtful construction can obscure, in the judgment of any man that is reasonable.

§ 17. Nay, among the very heathen, that have made any mention of the Christian faith, doth not Pliny's epistle concerning the Christians<sup>y</sup> acknowledge, that they sung hymns to Christ, as to God? Doth not Lucian in his *Philopatris*<sup>z</sup> manifestly express the faith of the Trinity, as the cognizance of Christians at that time? Hath it not appeared<sup>a</sup> by those<sup>b</sup> inventions wherewith the Gnostics sophisticated it, that "the fulness of the Godhead" consists in the Trinity according to the Christian faith, as according to the several sects of them in their several inventions; that the Christians honoured and worshipped the blessed Trinity, as those sects did those imaginations of their own, which they call "the fulness of the Godhead?" When Ebion, Cerinthus, Artemon, Theodorus, and after them, Sabellius, Noetus,

[Evidence of heathens and of heretics to the Catholic doctrine.]

\* See above, c. xiii. § 2. notes k—o, and § 3 sq.: Petavius, De Trin., lib. viii. c. ii. § 3 sq.; Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. pp. 790 sq.; and for the Jews, Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch., cc. xiii.—xv.

<sup>y</sup> "Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem." &c. C. Di. Epist., lib. x. Epist.

<sup>19</sup> ed. Longol.

<sup>z</sup> "Κριτ. Καὶ τίνα ἐπομόσμου γέ; Τριεφ. Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεόν, μέγαν, ἀμβροτον, οὐρανίωνα, Τίδν Πατρός, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρός ἐκπορευόμενον, \* Ἐν ἐκ Τριῶν, καὶ δεξ' Ἐνδς Τρία, Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ Θεόν." Lucian, Philopat., c. 12: Op., tom. iii. pp. 596, 597. ed. Reitz.

<sup>a</sup> Above, cc. xii. § 15 sq.; xv. § 10, 12.

<sup>b</sup> Corrected from MS. "these," in orig. text.

BOOK II. Praxeas, and Paulus Samosatenus, were disowned by the 125 whole Church, and excluded the communion of all Christians, did not all Churches, that agreed in refusing them, find themselves possessed of a contrary faith, as the reason for which they were refused? Were all Christians, out of their simplicity, cunning enough to assail all the reasons, whereby these, and Arius to boot, did or might argue their pretences from texts of Scripture? Or did they think themselves bound to rest in the visible consent of the whole Church, whether they were able to do that or not?

[Petavius' explanation of ante-Nicene language unsatisfactory.]

§ 18. In fine, the learned Jesuit Petavius, in the Preface to his Books *De Trinitate*, and the beginning of the first <sup>c</sup>, as he hath evidently shewed, that the substance of the faith of the Trinity is acknowledged by these ancient Christians, some of whose words seem to disparage the Godhead of our Lord Christ; so he endeavoureth to shew, that they did it out of a desire to reconcile the faith with the doctrine of Plato and his followers. If his opinion be admitted, there will remain evidence enough for the tradition of faith; even in their writings, whose skill in the Scriptures goes not the right way to maintain it. The plain song will be good music, though the descant transgress. Though, for my part, having seen what he hath said, I repent me not of that which I had conceived out of Tertullian: that out of a desire to reconcile the "creation" of Wisdom in the Proverbs according to the Greek (not the doctrine of Plato) with the rule of faith, they conceived this a supposition fit to do it; that by God's proceeding to create the world, His Mind or Wisdom, Which incarnate is our Lord Christ, attained, not the essence and being which It had in God from everlasting, but the denomination and quality of His Word and Son. For you shall find there, that most of them concur in the speculation <sup>d</sup> of Tertullian <sup>e</sup>.

[Prov. viii. 22.]

<sup>c</sup> Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. Præfat. (not paged) and pp. 1 sq. The title of c. vi. of the Preface runs thus—"Epilogus Præfationis, in quo docetur, quemadmodum mira quadam ratione Veteres illi in eo ipso traditionem dogmatis de Trinitate adstruunt, in quo illi adversari videntur." &c. And in lib. i. c. i. § 2. p. 2, the writer asserts, that "quidquid hæreseon opinionumque falsarum primis illis Ecclesiæ temporibus emerit, ac præsertim Ariana tota

perfidia, ex illo Platonicorum commento caussam et originem accepit."

<sup>d</sup> Corrected from MS. "speculations," in orig. text.

<sup>e</sup> "Nonnullis veterum illa de Divinitate ac Personarum in ea diversitate insederat opinio, unum esse summum, ingenitum, neque aspectabilem Deum, id est, Verbum vel Sermonem, Quem *ἐνδιδθητορ* (intus inclusum) tenebat, ex Sese foras produxerit, vocalem et sonantem; nec tamen vocis instar sonique



§ 19. Whereby you may see, that this learned Jesuit is not agreed with the Cardinal du Perron<sup>f</sup>, to derive the reason why we hold the faith of the Holy Trinity originally from the decree of the council of Nicæa, and from that authority of the Church which maintaineth it; but from the reason whereupon that decree was ground and made, that is, from the meaning of the Scriptures expressed and limited by the tradition of the Church. And therefore, not burdening myself here with the expounding of all those passages of their writings before Arius, which may seem to derogate from the tradition of the Church in that point; I shall refer the reader to those things, whereby he sheweth, that they do unanimously concur in maintaining the same faith<sup>g</sup>. For if there be amongst them, that have had speculations tending to reconcile some Scriptures to it, which are not only ill grounded (as I dispute not but this of Tertullian is), but also prejudicial to the faith, as some of Origen's, whom I have mentioned already<sup>h</sup>; that this is to be imputed to the inconsequence of their several discourses, not to any difference in the<sup>i</sup> common faith, I remit you to that which he hath said<sup>k</sup> to judge. Only, whereas he, [lib.] 2 *De Trinitate*, [c.] ii.<sup>l</sup>, hath given you a full account of those fathers, which expound the words of our Lord, "The Father is greater than I," to be meant of His Godhead (which I have only named in gross), I will advise you again<sup>m</sup> hereupon, that many things which are said of the Son as inferior to the Father (as when He is said to 'minister unto the Father' in creating the world<sup>n</sup>), may be

CHAP.  
XVII.

[He maintains the orthodoxy of ante-Nicene doctrine.]

transeuntem ac dissipabilem, sed ejusmodi, ut velut corporatus ac subsistens cætera deinceps effecerit. Tum autem a supremo Deo ac Patre productum esse dixerunt, cum hanc rerum universitatem moliri statuit, ut illum velut administrum adhiberet. Quam sententiam alii clarius, obscurius alii significant: sed isti fere, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Theophilus, Tertullianus, ac Lactantius. Tam ii vero quam reliqui quos commemoravi" (scil. Justin Martyr, S. Clement of Rome, Origen, Novatian, and others), "ævo, dignitate, ac potentia superiorem esse Verbo Patrem arbitrati sunt; ac tametsi de Patris esse substantia, sive natura, Filium asserunt, qua una re ab cæteris, quæ creaturæ propriæ vocantur, illius conditionem diversam faciebant; non minus tamen quam creaturæ initium habuisse, hoc

est, minime ex æterno distinctam hypostasim fuisse putabant." Petav., *De Trin.*, lib. i. c. v. § 7: *Theol. Dogm.*, tom. ii. pp. 29, 30. And see the whole chapter.

<sup>f</sup> See above, § 12. But see Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.*, Proem. § 5—8; *Works*, vol. v. pp. 6—13; and Waterland, *Second Vindic. of Christ's Divinity*, Pref.; *Works*, vol. iii. pp. xvii., xviii.

<sup>g</sup> See Petav., *De Trin.*, Preface.

<sup>h</sup> Above, § 11; and c. x. § 6, notes p, q.

<sup>i</sup> Corrected from MS. "their," in orig. text.

<sup>k</sup> Petav., *De Trin.*, lib. i. cc. iv. § 2—9, v. § 1—4; *Theol. Dogm.*, tom. ii. pp. 17—21, 24—28.

<sup>l</sup> *Theol. Dogm.*, tom. ii. pp. 99—108.

<sup>m</sup> See above, § 8, 9.

<sup>n</sup> See above, § 10. notes y—d.

**BOOK** imputed, not to any inequality in that Godhead, which is the  
**II.** same in all the Trinity, but unto the manner of having it  
 (the Father originally, as the fountain, the Son and the Holy  
 Ghost as from Him), wherein the difference of the Persons  
 consisteth °.

[Reason  
 why our  
 Lord is  
 called the  
 Word, con-  
 firmed  
 from Peta-  
 vius.]

§ 20. To the same Petavius, [lib.] 8 *De Trinitate*, [c.] ii. <sup>p</sup>, I  
 remit them that would be satisfied of the sense of the fathers,  
 in that which I alleged for the reason why our Lord is called  
 “the Word” by St. John; to wit, that the intercourse be-  
 tween God and man, after the fall, was executed and managed  
 by His ministry <sup>q</sup>. Not because I think this name of “the  
 Word” unfit to signify the original proceeding of the Son  
 from the Father, much less His concurrence in and to the  
 creation of all things; but because, believing as I do that  
 the mystery of the Trinity is revealed by the coming of our  
 Lord, I find great reason to conceive, that His Apostle in-  
 tended thereby to intimate, that the godly of the Old Testa-  
 ment were reconciled to God by the means of His Word and  
 Spirit, howsoever they understood that which is signified by  
 these titles. I know the Arians made their advantage of  
 that which Justin and others had said <sup>r</sup>,—that God employed  
 His Son to man, because He was Himself invisible,—to say  
 thereupon, that the Father only is invisible and incompre-  
 hensible, even by the Son: and that St. Austin thereupon  
 counts it rashness to say, that all the intercourse between  
 God and man was ministered by the Son, the Father and  
 the Holy Ghost not appearing at all in any of these revela-  
 tions<sup>s</sup>: that Dionysius<sup>t</sup> acknowledgeth, that all of them,  
 Athanasius<sup>u</sup>, that some of them, were done by the ministry  
 of angels: the testimonies whereof you may find collected  
 there<sup>x</sup>. And truly, that God the Father was not revealed by  
 these apparitions, were a thing utterly unreasonable to ima-

° See Bp. Bull as cited above, § 8.  
 note q.

<sup>p</sup> Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. pp. 789—  
 802.

<sup>q</sup> See above, cc. xiii. § 2, xv. § 9.

<sup>r</sup> See Petav., *De Trin.*, lib. i. c. iii.  
 § 2; *Theol. Dogm.*, tom. ii. pp. 11, 12;  
 and above, c. xiii. § 2. notes k—o.

<sup>s</sup> S. Aug., *De Trin.*, lib. ii. cc. viii.  
 sq. (*Op.*, tom. viii. pp. 780 sq.) ; where  
 the subject is discussed at length. And  
 see Petavius as just cited, lib. viii. c.

ii. § 16. pp. 799, 800.

<sup>t</sup> “Ταύτας δὲ τὰς θέλας ὁράσεις οἱ κλει-  
 νοὶ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐμνοῦντο διὰ μεσῶν  
 τῶν οὐρανίων δυνάμεων.” κ. τ. λ. Dion.  
*Areop.*, *De Cœl. Hierarch.*, c. iv.; *Op.*,  
 p. 19. B. Paris. 1615. See Petav., *ibid.*,  
 § 15. p. 799.

<sup>u</sup> S. Athanas., *Orat. iii. cont. Arian.*,  
 c. 12; *Op.*, tom. i. P. i. pp. 561, 562:  
 giving instances. See Petav., *ibid.*, § 6,  
 pp. 792, 793.

<sup>x</sup> Petav., *ibid.*, pp. 789 sq.



gine. That God's angels did attend upon His Son in those messages, wherein some one of them carries the proper name of God, is a thing which the Scriptures alleged afore<sup>y</sup> will necessarily require. But that, wheresoever God deals with man by the ministry of an angel, to whom the proper name and honour of God is attributed, there the Son of God came to do God's word to man, for a preface to His coming in the flesh; and that whosoever received this word from God, was withal possessed by His Spirit: as I see it is very agreeable to the Scripture, so I find no reason valuable, why I should repent me to have said it<sup>z</sup>.

CHAP.  
XVII.

§ 21. I know, that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, hath been alleged for an authority, that interrupteth the tradition of the Church in the matter of the Trinity<sup>a</sup>. And I acknowledge St. Basil's judgment; comparing him with one, who, dressing plants, and finding one that grows awry, bends it so without measure, that he sets it as much awry on the other side<sup>b</sup>. For, writing against Sabellius, and not content to settle the difference of the Persons, he says, that through heat of contention he let fall words, that signified also "*οὐσίας διαφορὰν, καὶ δυνάμεως ὑφεσιν, καὶ δόξης παραλλαγήν*"—"difference of nature, inferiority of power, and diversity of glory:" Epist. xli.<sup>c</sup> Whereof though I intend not to question any part, I will say, nevertheless, as I have alleged this passage of Dionysius in evidence for the unity of the Church, so here, that I desire no better evidence for the rule of faith, which the same presupposeth. Suppose for the present the sense of Dionysius to be questionable: as it was to those<sup>d</sup>

[Dionysius  
of Alexan-  
dria.]

<sup>y</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 4.

<sup>z</sup> See above, c. xiii. § 3—6.

<sup>a</sup> "Φασὶ τοίνυν ἐν ἐπιστολῇ τὸν μακαρίτην Διονύσιον εἰρηκέναι, ποίημα καὶ γενητὸν εἶναι τὸν Τίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, μήτε δὲ φύσει ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν Αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ Πατρὸς· ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀμπελον, καὶ ὁ ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τὸ σκάφος· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ποίημα ὢν, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται. καὶ ἔγραψεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς εἶναι τοιαύτην ἐπιστολὴν αὐτοῦ." S. Athanas., Epist. de Sentent. Dionys., c. 4; Op., tom. i. P. i. p. 246. A: proceeding to explain the sentiments of Dionysius by his other writings and by the controversial bearing of his words against Sabellius. See Petav., *ibid.* lib. i. c. iv. § 10. pp.

21, 22.

<sup>b</sup> "Ἐλῶθα γοῦν ἀπεικάξειν τοῦτον" (Dionysium) "ἐγὼ φυτοκόμφ, νεαροῦ φυτοῦ διαστροφὴν ἀπευθύνοντι, εἴτα τῇ ἀμετρίᾳ τῆς ἀνβολικῆς διαμαρτόντι τοῦ μέσου, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον ἀπαγαγόντι τὸ βλάστημα. Τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον γεγεννημένον εὗρομεν. Ἀντιβαῖναν γὰρ σφοδρῶς τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ τοῦ Λίβυος, ἔλαθεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ ἐνάντιον κακὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγαν φιλοτιμίας ὑπενεχθεῖς." S. Basil. M., Epist. ix. (xli. edit. before Bened.), § 2; Op., tom. iii. p. 90. C, D.

<sup>c</sup> Id., *ibid.*, p. 90 D.

<sup>d</sup> Corrected from MS. "these," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

bishops of Pentapolis his suffragans, who, finding themselves offended at that which he had written, gave information of it to Dionysius then bishop of Rome, and to his synod; which Athanasius (*De Synodis Arimin. et Seleuciæ* <sup>e</sup>) expressly nominateth. Can there be a greater argument, that the communion of the Church stood grounded upon the profession of that faith, which he seemed to transgress; than the concurrence of Rome, and the Churches that resorted to Rome, with those which resorted to Alexandria, in that faith which he seemed to transgress? Certainly, the agreement of all Christians in admitting the Scriptures at this day, is not able to produce the like. And therefore, granting the writings of Dionysius to have been an attempt upon the faith, the opposition that was so warmly made, assures us, [that] that doctrine, which the authority of a bishop of Alexandria could not give passport to, was inconsistent with the rule in force. For the satisfaction which he tendered in the letter recorded by Athanasius <sup>f</sup>, shews what the sense of the Church was, for satisfaction whereof he was forced to write. And, therefore, I may safely, and do, acknowledge some of his words to be more offensive, than it can be fit for me to excuse: though his own letter alleges the similitudes of a plant and the shoot of it, of a well and the stream flowing from it <sup>g</sup>, with which the Church since Arius hath always used to make it understood. Which may seem to render him reconcilable to the faith of Nicæa, by understanding the difference which he signifieth, to consist, not in the Godhead, which may be understood to be the same in the fountain as in the stream, but in the rank and manner of having it, necessarily rendering that which proceedeth, in that regard inferior to that, from whence it proceedeth.

[The council of Antioch, A.D. 270, against Paul of Samosata.]

§ 22. I know it is said again, that the council of eighty <sup>127</sup> bishops that condemned Samosatenus at Antiochia, in their epistle alleged there by Athanasius, do say, that the Son is

<sup>e</sup> “Ἡ μὲν κατὰ Ῥώμην Σύνοδος” κ.τ.λ. S. Athan., *De Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc.*, c. 43; Op., tom. i. P. ii. p. 757. F.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid., pp. 757. F, 758. A: and *Epist. de Sentent. Dionys.*, c. 13; Op., tom. i. P. i. p. 252. C.

<sup>g</sup> Apud S. Athanas., *Epist. de Sentent. Dionys.*, c. 18; Op., tom. i. P. i. pp. 255. E, 256. A. And see the express declaration of faith in the Holy Trinity quoted from Dionysius by St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, c. xxix. § 72; Op., tom. iii. p. 60. E.



not “ὁμοούσιος”—“of the same substance” with the Father<sup>h</sup>; and that it is said, that the two parts of a contradiction may as well be reconciled, as this with the faith of Nicæa. But with what judgment, let St. Hilary speak, *Libro de Synodis*<sup>1</sup>. “*Male intelligitur homousion; quid ad me bene intelligentem? male homousion Samosatenus confessus est; sed nunquid melius Ariani negaverunt? octoginta episcopi olim respuerunt; sed trecenti et decem octo nuper receperunt*”—“The homoousion is wrong understood; what is that to me that understand it right? Samosatenus acknowledged it wrong; were the Arians more in the right in denying it? fourscore bishops refused it long since; three hundred and eighteen have received it of late.” This had been enough to make a reasonable man suspect an equivocation in the business. But Athanasius would have told him, wherein it consisted, and how and in what sense Samosatenus maintained it. His argument was: If our Lord Christ were not made God of man, which first He had been made, then must He be “ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ”—“of the same substance with the Father;” and so there shall be three substances, one principal, that of the Father, two proceeding from Him, of the Son and Holy Ghost<sup>k</sup>. And shall not all that embrace the creed of Nicæa, disdain consubstantiality in this sense? which plainly makes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of the same substance, no otherwise than three men are said to be of one substance.

§ 23. I know Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea might have been further alleged; out of St. Basil, Epist. lxiv.<sup>1</sup>: where he

[St. Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea.]

<sup>h</sup> “Ἐπειδὴ δὲ, ὡς αὐτοὶ φασί, τὴν γὰρ ἐπιστολὴν οὐκ ἔσχον ἐγώ· οἱ τὸν Σαμοσατέα κατακρίναντες ἐπίσκοποι γράφοντες εἰρήκασιν μὴ εἶναι ὁμοούσιον τὸν Τῆν τῷ Πατρὶ.” S. Athan., De Synodis Arimin. et Seleuc., c. 43; Op., tom. i. P. ii. p. 757. C. The bishops at the Antiochene council were seventy according to S. Athanasius (ibid. E), eighty according to S. Hilary (see next note).—See Petav., De Trin., lib. iv. c. v. § 2; Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. p. 348; and Bp. Bull, Def. Fid. Nic., Sect. ii. c. i. § 9; Works, vol. v. P. i. pp. 82—98.

<sup>1</sup> S. Hilary, Pictav., De Synodis seu de Fide Orientalium, c. 86; Op., p. 1200. B.

<sup>k</sup> “Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν Σαμοσατέα καθελόντες, σωματικῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες τὸ ὁμοούσιον, τοῦ Παύλου σοφίζεσθαι τε θέλοντος καὶ λέγοντος, Εἰ μὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γέγονεν ὁ Χριστὸς Θεὸς, οὐκοῦν ὁμοούσιός ἐστι τῷ Πατρὶ· καὶ ἀνάγκη τρεῖς οὐσίας εἶναι, μίαν μὲν προηγουμένην, τὰς δὲ δύο ἐξ ἐκείνης· διὰ τοῦτο εἰκότως εὐλαβηθέντες τὸ τοιοῦτον σόφισμα τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, εἰρήκασιν μὴ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον.” S. Athan., De Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc., c. 46; Op., tom. i. P. ii. p. 759. A, B.

<sup>1</sup> S. Basil. M., Epist. ad Primor. Neo-Cæsareæ, Epist. ccx. (lxiv. edit. before Bened.), § 5; Op., tom. iii. p. 316. C, D.

BOOK II. acknowledgeth him to have called the Father and the Son

“ἐπινοία μὲν δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἓν;” and the Son, “κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα.” But this, in a discourse written to Ælian a pagan, to convert him to Christianity, and at the bottom consisting of nothing but equivocation of terms: he allowing himself to term the Son “the creature and make” of the Father, whom the Greek fathers commonly call “αἵτλαν” or “the cause” of the Son; and to call them “two in notion but one for hypostasis,” because he takes “hypostasis” for “substance,” and “notion” for that character which distinguisheth between persons, which in the now terms of the school are said to be known and discerned by their notions<sup>m</sup>.

[Origen and his scholars.]

§ 24. But I will go no further in Origen’s behalf, or in behalf of any scholar of Origen’s. If he have left that which necessarily imports an ill sense (whereof his scholars, Dionysius, or Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, may perhaps relish), either it was not publicly taken notice of when it was published, or passed over in silence for the present in respect of his merit toward the Church; as it must be said of his opinion concerning souls fitting into new bodies.

[Eusebius and the author of the Apostolic Constitutions.]

§ 25. As for Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the author of the Constitutions, which are both charged in this point<sup>n</sup>: Eusebius, living in the time when the consent of the Church overruled the contrary, rather evidenceth than interrupteth that tradition, which condemneth him if he agree not with it. But the author of the Constitutions is not known, at what time he lived, to write, in the name of Clemens the

<sup>m</sup> “Τοῦτο δὲ ὅτι οὐ δογματικῶς εἴρηται ἀλλ’ ἀγωνιστικῶς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Αἰλιανὸν διαλέξει, οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν συνιδεῖν, οἱ ἐπὶ λεπτότητι τῶν φρένων ἑαυτοὺς μακαρίζοντες. Ἐν ᾗ πολλὰ τῶν ἀπογραψαμένων ἐστὶ σφάλματα. . . ἐπειτα μέντοι τὸν Ἐλ- λῆνα πείθων, οὐχ ἡγεῖτο χρῆναι ἀκριβο- λογέσθαι περὶ τὰ ῥήματα· ἀλλ’ ἐστὶν ὅση καὶ συνδιδόντα τῷ ἔθει τοῦ ἐναγο- μένου, ὡς ἂν μὴ ἀντιτεῖνοι πρὸς τὰ καίρια· διὸ δὴ καὶ πολλὰς ἂν εὐροὺς ἐκεῖ φωνὰς, τὰς νῦν τοῖς αἵρετικοῖς μεγίστην ἰσχὺν παρεχομένας.” S. Basil. M., *ibid.*—See Petav., *De Trin.*, lib. i. c. iv. § 10; Theol., Dogm., tom. ii. p. 22; and Bp. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.*, Sect. ii. c. xii. § 6, 7; Works, vol. v. P. i. pp. 428—433.

<sup>n</sup> Petavius (*De Trin.*, lib. i. cc. xi., xii. pp. 56—72) charges Eusebius of Cæsarea with Arianism. Bp. Bull (*Def. Fid. Nic.*, Sect. iii. c. ix. § 11, Sect. iv. c. i. § 10; Works, vol. v. P. ii. pp. 627—632, 700, 701) defends him. So also Cave, *Epist. Apolog. &c.* (at the end of his *Hist. Lit.*); which is an express defence of Eusebius on this point against Le Clerc. And see Socrat., *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. ii. c. 21. pp. 103—106.—“Clemens Romanus . . in Constitutionibus Apostolicis ridiculum nescio quid et hæreticum de Trinitate posuit. Nam Episcopum in Ecclesia instar esse Dei Patris ait,” &c. (as quoted in next note) Petav., *ibid.*, lib. i. c. iii. § 7.



Apostles' scholar, that which for his part he thought most likely to come from the Apostles°. Whether or no he might think it became him, writing in that name, to use such terms as he found the ancientest Church writers use before the business of Arius; whether or no he might mistake himself in doing so: I will not dispute. But being hard to believe, that he writ till the heresy of Arius and Eunomius was down<sup>p</sup>; as I can give myself no good reason, why he should bring in Arius under the habit of the Apostles, so I see the suspicion which he hath contracted, in a manner as ancient as the credit of his book in the Church<sup>q</sup>.

§ 26. After all this, if any man marvel, that Alexander bishop of Alexandria should think so slightly of Arius his opinion, as, in debating it, sometimes to side with him, sometimes with his adversaries, according to Sozomenus, *Eccles. Hist.* i. 15<sup>r</sup>: let him consider, that the ecclesiastical historians inform us, that the difference of Arius was commenced at a consistory, that is, at a meeting of the clergy to debate the business<sup>r</sup>; only Sozomenus [informs us<sup>s</sup>], that there had been divers meetings about it, in which Alexander had 128 not declared himself, but spoken sometimes on this side and sometimes on that<sup>t</sup>. Not because there is any appearance

[Of Alexander and Arius.]

° "Οὗτος" (scil. the bishop) "ὁμῶν ἐπίγειος Θεὸς μετὰ Θεόν. . . Ὁ ἐπίσκοπος προκαθεζέσθω ὁμῶν ὡς Θεοῦ ἀξία τετιμημένος" . . ὁ δὲ διάκονος τούτῳ παριστάσθω, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ λειτουργεῖτω αὐτῷ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμέμπτως, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιῶν οὐδὲν τὰ ἀρεστὰ ποιεῖ τῷ Πατρὶ πάντοτε." *Constit. Apost.*, lib. ii. c. 26; ap. Cotelier., *PP. Apost.*, tom. i. pp. 241, 242.—"Ad Sandium venio, qui ex Constitutionum libris sanctum Clementem Romanum Arianismi arguit. Credas hominem post fidei et bonæ conscientiæ naufragium pudorem quoque omnem perdidisse. Quippe consentiunt reformati theologi omnes, neque reclamant hodie ex pontificiis critici doctiores, clamant vero res ipsa, Constitutiones illas Clementis non esse." *Bull. Def. Fid. Nic.*, Sect. ii. c. iii. § 5; *Works*, vol. v. P. i. pp. 140, 141.—"Ἐν τοῖς νόμοις κατατετάχθη . . . τῶν Ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδάχαί." *Euseb.*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii. c. 25. p. 97. B, C.—"Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ Ἀδδianoὶ παραφέρουσι τὴν τῶν Ἀποστόλων διάταξιν,

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδόκιμον." *Epiphan.*, *Adv. Hær.*, lib. iii. tom. i. *Hær.* 70. § 10; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 822. A.—And see the passages collected in Cotelierus' *Prolegom.* to the *Apost. Constitutions*.

<sup>p</sup> See *Service of God at Relig. Assemblies*, c. x. § 26.

<sup>q</sup> The *Recognitions*, according to Photius (*Biblioth.*, cod. 113. p. 289. ed. Schottus), "τῆς εἰς τὸν Τῖδον βλασφημίας κατὰ τὴν Ἀρείου δόξαν ἐστὶν ἀνάπλεως· αἱ δὲ γε Διαταγαὶ τρισὶ μόνοις δοκοῦσιν ἐνέχεσθαι κακοπλαστία, ἣν οὐ χαλεπὸν ἀποσκευάσασθαι."

<sup>r</sup> "Ἀμφηρίστου δὲ τῆς ζητήσεως ἐτι δοκούσης εἶναι, πέπονθέ τι καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος τὰ πρῶτα, πῇ μὲν τούτους, πῇ δὲ ἐκείνους ἐπαινῶν· τελευτὴν δὲ τοῖς ὁμοούσιον καὶ συναΐδιον εἶναι τὸν Τῖδον ἀποφαινομένοις ἔθετο." *Sozom.*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. i. c. 15. pp. 426. D, 427. A. ed. Vales.

<sup>s</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 426.—*Socrat.*, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. i. c. 5. p. 9. ed. Vales.—*Euseb.*, *De Vita Constantini*, lib. ii. c. 69. pp. 474, 475. ed. Vales.

<sup>t</sup> Added from MS.

<sup>u</sup> *Sozom.*, as quoted in note r.

BOOK II. in the story, that Arius himself could have construed his proceedings as if he had been doubtful which side to choose; but because any wise man, in his place, would have thought it the way to preserve his authority over Arius, by not declaring himself party against him, till he appeared untractable by that reason, which his authority must enforce, when itself would not serve the turn.

[Constantine the Great.]

§ 27. As for the great Constantine, who, in his letter to the Church of Alexandria, declareth many times that the question concerned not the substance of faith<sup>v</sup>: it must be said, that being no Christian as yet, nor catechized in the faith, his information failed; either in matter of fact, reporting the position of Arius in such terms as might bear a good construction (in which what latitude there is, it may appear by the premises), or in point of right, making that not to concern the substance of faith, which indeed doth. For those terms, in which all the ecclesiastical histories agree that the debate was stated, are such, as indeed do concern the substance of faith.

§ 28. Neither is there any mark in the writings of the fathers before this time, upon which it can be said, that any of them thought, that there was a time when the Word of God (Which being incarnate is<sup>x</sup> our Lord Christ) was not, but was made by God of nothing after that time; which are the characters that distinguish the heresy of Arius<sup>y</sup>.

§ 29. Set aside then the Constitutions, Eusebius, Origen, and his scholar Dionysius, as questionable in point of fact, or as granted, that the sense of their words is not reconcilable with the faith in point of right, the retraction of Dionysius<sup>z</sup> makes as much more for the faith than his misprision (condemned by Gennadius, *De Dogm. Eccl.*, cap. iv.<sup>a</sup>, and Facundus, x. 5<sup>b</sup>) against it, as the rejecting of Sabellius makes

<sup>v</sup> “Ζητήσεις, πόσας μὴ νόμου τινὸς ἀνάγκη προστάττει, ἀλλ’ ἀνωφελοῦς ἀργίας ἐρρασχέλια προστίθουσιν.” Epist. Constant. M., ap. Euseb., *De Vita Constant.*, lib. ii. c. 69. p. 475. A.—“Τῇ λαῶν εὐθήσει, καὶ οἷα δῆποτέ ἐστιν ἐκείνη ἡ ζήτησις.” Id., *ibid.*, c. 71. p. 476. D.

<sup>x</sup> Corrected from MS. “in,” in orig. text.

<sup>y</sup> “Ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων

ἐγένετο.” Socrat., *H. E.*, lib. i. c. 8. pp. 22, D, 23. A. See above, § 14. note u.

<sup>z</sup> See above, § 21.

<sup>a</sup> “Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credamus, ut vult Dionysius fons Arii.” Gennad. Massiliensis, *De Eccles. Dogm.*, c. iv. p. 4. ed. Elmenhorst. Gennadius lived in the end of the fifth century.

<sup>b</sup> The words of Dionysius, says Facundus (*Pro Defens. Trium Capital.*



more for the same than the doubtful words of Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea against. CHAP.  
XVII.

§ 30. That which is to be said thereupon is, that there can be therefore no reason to blame the council of Nicæa for adding to the Creed the term of “ὁμοούσιος,” to oblige the Arians to the sense of the Church. St. Athanasius, in his treatise *De Actis Conc. Nicæn.*<sup>c</sup>, hath shewed us, that it was introduced to cut off those equivocations, whereby they thought to cover their own sense under those other words, which were propounded as capable of the Catholic sense. He that will say, that this course ought not to have been held, or that, having taken effect, it ought not to have been retained, may as well say, that the faith of Christ or the unity of God’s service in that faith is not to be preserved. For, being once questioned, there must be a rule and a mark to discern Christians from heretics. I observe therefore, likewise, that the troubles which Arius occasioned in the Church never came to an end, till the word “*persona*” in Latin and “*hypostasis*” in Greek was admitted, in opposition to the word “essence” or “nature” included in the word “ὁμοούσιος,” which the council of Nicæa had introduced into the creed; that the difference between the Church and Arius might be stated upon the express terms of “Three Persons and One Nature.” For it is evident by St. Jerome, Epist. lvii.<sup>d</sup>, that the term of “*hypostasis*” for “person” was not then received (who writes to Pope Damasus to be authorized by him, whether to admit, or to refuse it). But as after that time we hear no further question of the term, so under the Emperor Gratian and Pope Damasus we find the dispute extinguished<sup>e</sup>. But I say, nevertheless, that there is

[Of the new terms, ὁμοούσιος, ὑπόστασις, *Persona*; and their effect in securing old doctrine.]

lib. x. c. 5; in Bibl. Max. PP. ed. De la Bigne, tom. x. p. 86. G. sq.), “Athanasius constanter exceptit, et quamvis nostris auribus dura et ad excusandum difficilia, defendere non refugit.”

<sup>c</sup> De Decretis Synodi Nicæni, cc. 20. sq.; Op., tom. i. P. i. pp. 225. C, sq.

<sup>d</sup> “Nunc igitur proh dolor! post Nicenam fidem, post Alexandrinum juncto pariter Occidente decretum, trium hypostasewn ab Arianorum Præsule et Campensibus, novellum a me homine Romano nomen exigitur. Qui

quæso ista Apostoli prodidere? . . Interrogemus, quid tres hypostases posse arbitrentur intelligi. Tres personas subsistentes aiunt. Respondemus nos ita credere? Non sufficit sensus, ipsum nomen efflagitant. . . Decernite obsecro si placet, non timebo tres hypostases dicere: si jubetis, condatur nova post Nicenam fides, et similibus verbis cum Arianis confiteamur orthodoxi.” S. Hieron., Epist. xiv. (lvii. edit. before Bened.), Ad Damasum Papam; Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 20.

<sup>e</sup> “Φρονοῦμεν . . μὴν εἶναι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν

BOOK  
II.

no cause therefore to imagine, that the sense of the Church and the faith thereof hath received any change by the use of new terms, which the necessity of preventing heretics hath obliged the Church to introduce. And I say, as the others said, that the importance and consequence of the said new terms ought to be reduced to that force, which the sense of the Church according to the Scriptures alloweth, or rather prescribeth; and that whosoever shall take upon him, under pretence of the most unquestionable decrees that any age of the Church hath produced, to prescribe against that sense which the primitive records of the Church do enforce, in so doing, sets up the authority of the present Church against the tradition of the Catholic.

[Whether  
St. Hilary  
calleth the  
Holy Ghost  
God.]

§ 31. And, after all this, shall the Socinians be admitted to allege, that St. Hilary maketh<sup>s</sup> a doubt whether the Holy Ghost is to be called God or not<sup>h</sup>? Surely the Socinians cannot be admitted to allege this, unless they will be content to submit to St. Hilary in the whole business: nay, unless they will stand to the Church, to which St. Hilary stands. But for those that are not Socinians, and would be satisfied, I will not use that wretched answer of Erasmus in that excellent preface to St. Hilary's works, that the Church hath since decreed otherwise<sup>i</sup>: as if there were not a reason why the Church so decreed, or as if he were not bound to render that reason for his discharge. But I will say, that (as in the case of the Nicene Creed and the word *ὁμοούσιος*) it appear-

*οὐσίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις, τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐν τρισὶ τελείαις ὑποστάσεσιν.*" Epist. Imp. Valentiniani et Valentis et Gratiani ad Asianam Diocesim scripta de Consubstantiali, ap. Theodor., Hist. Eccles., lib. iv. c. 8. p. 160. A. ed. Vales.—And see Petav., De Trin., lib. iv. c. i. § 5 sq.; Dogm. Theol., tom. ii. pp. 313 sq.; Bp. Bull, Def. Fid. Nic., Sect. ii. c. ix. § 11; Works, vol. v. P. i. pp. 308—324: and Newman, Arians, c. v. sect. ii. pp. 389—397.

<sup>i</sup> Corrected from MS. "that," in orig. text.

<sup>s</sup> Corrected from MS. "quitteth," in orig. text.

<sup>h</sup> "Atque hic illud commemorare operæ pretium est, quod viri docti annotarunt (scil. Erasm. in Præfat. ad Hilarium), Hilarium in duodecim de Trini-

tate libris Spiritum Sanctum nuspiam appellasse Deum, nuspiam dixisse adorandum, sed tantum promerendum: quod idem in aliis tum illius tum superiorum temporum scriptoribus observant." Crellius, De Uno Deo Patre, lib. i. Sect. iii. c. 2; Op., tom. iv. p. 67. a.

<sup>i</sup> Certain editors of St. Hilary, says Erasmus (Præf. in Op. Hilar. p. 2.—not paged—fol. Basil. 1535), added the words "adorandus est" to a passage of their author, "veriti nimirum ne quis suspicaretur illum sensisse Spiritum Sanctum non esse adorandum; quum multis modis doceat Patrem et Filium adorandum, de Spiritu nihil tale pronuntiet; videlicet quia non incidit aut quia nondum hoc id temporis erat exacte definitum." And see the end of the next note.



eth, that the Church may be necessitated to use such expressions as have not been in use afore; and not only to allow particular persons as doctors of the Church to use them, but to give them passport and authority in the public service of the Church. And that people or doctors of the Church should stick at them when they are first frequented, is no more to be marvelled at, than that the Socinians should marvel, that the Son of God, Who acknowledges to come from the Father and to receive all from Him, should by any man be acknowledged God from everlasting: unless it be marvelled, that all that allow it not, are not Socinians. For neither is it any marvel, that men should marvel at the due consequences of those things which themselves admit; nor that, marvelling at them, some should be Socinians, others continue Christians. All this would be good, in case it did appear, that St. Hilary had any where put any doubt, whether the Holy Ghost may be called God or not. But the observation of Erasmus bears no more than this, that St. Hilary is no where found to call the Holy Ghost God<sup>1</sup>: which who will not laugh at, unless it could be said that St. Hilary no way says as much as that is? For shall the faith of the Church, or shall the faith of St. Hilary, depend upon the use of that word? Shall it not serve his turn, that he useth words signifying the same? Which had Erasmus been so diligent to collect, as the Socinians have been forward to make advantage of his negligence, they had never drawn that observation into consequence. He that would be satisfied of St. Hilary's faith, as well as of the faith of the Church before St. Hilary, in this point, let him peruse what Petavius hath

<sup>1</sup> "In his evolvendia illud obiter subiit animum meum, fortasse non defuturos qui mirentur, quod, quum tot libris, tanto studio, tantoque molimine, tot argumentis, tot sententiis, tot anathematis agatur, ut credamus Filium esse verum Deum, ejusdem essentiae sive (ut aliquoties loquitur Hilarius) ejusdem generis aut naturae cum Patre, quod Graeci vocant *ὁμοούσιον*, potentia, sapientia, bonitate, aeternitate, immortalitate, ceterisque rebus omnibus parem, de Spiritu Sancto interim vix ulla fiat mentio; cum tota controversia de cognomine veri Dei, de cognomine Homousii, de aequalitate, non minus tinent ad Spiritum quam ad Filium.

Imo nusquam scribit adorandum Spiritum Sanctum, nusquam tribuit Dei vocabulum; nisi quod uno aut altero loco in Synodis refert improbatos eos, qui Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum auderent dicere tres Deos: sive quia putarit tum magis patrocinandum Filio, Cujus humana natura faciebat ut difficilius persuaderetur Deum esse Qui idem esset Homo; et Hunc Ariani Divinitate spoliare tentabant, quum de Spiritu Sancto nondum esset agitata questio: sive haec veterum religio fuit, ut licet Deum pie venerarentur, nihil tamen de Eo pronuciare auderent quod non esset aperte traditum in sacris voluminibus." *Erasm., ibid., pp. 9, 10.*

BOOK collected, *Dogmatum Theol.*, [lib.] 3. *De Trinitate* [c.] vii.  
 II. 7—15<sup>k</sup>.

[The mys-  
 tery of the  
 Trinity,  
 how recon-  
 cileable  
 with rea-  
 son.]

§ 32. I am now, before I leave this point, to consider, what the light of reason argues against the mystery of the Trinity: which I acknowledge to seem so strong, that it seems to forbid all use of reason in them that admit the Christian faith. For, seeing all use of reason supposes this principle, that those things which agree or disagree in a third agree or disagree one with the other; and that the mystery of the Trinity infers, though the Father is God and the Son God, yet that the Son is not the Father: it seems, it cannot be maintained without disowning the use of reasonable discourse. This difficulty may be, and is, branched out into many difficulties. It is argued<sup>l</sup>: if so, then shall there be three Gods, the Father one, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost a third; or three substances of one Godhead, every Person being God, which is the substance of the Godhead; or that the same thing, the Godhead, shall subsist thrice, to wit, in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is argued<sup>l</sup>: if so, then shall every Person be three Persons, because every Person is God, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that the Persons of the Godhead shall be both really the same, and really diverse or not the same; being the same God, yet several Persons. It is argued further<sup>l</sup>: if so, then shall the Son of God be His own Son, because Son of that God, which the Son is; then may there as well be more Sons, and then infinite; then shall He be from everlasting, because God, and not from everlasting, because Son; then should the Father and the Holy Ghost have been incarnate, because one with the Son, Who is incarnate; then cannot the Son of God be man, because God before. But all these consequences contain but one and the same difficulty, from which they proceed; as the same soldiers are shewed in several arms, and the same meats served with several sauces<sup>m</sup>. For when the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,<sup>130</sup> (Persons subsisting before they are distinguished by our understanding,) are said to be one God, the ordinary discourse of reason, and the language that men use, infers three substances, each subsisting of itself; that is, three Gods; that

<sup>k</sup> Theol. Dogm., tom. ii. pp. 262— ii.; Op., tom. iv. pp. 89—106.

267. <sup>m</sup> Plutarch., in *Flam*

<sup>l</sup> Crellius, *De Uno Deo Patre*, lib. tom. ii. p. 422.



is, Persons of the Godhead : every one of them, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as God is ; the same with themselves, supposing one God ; not the same, supposing three Persons. Again, the Son being God (as the Father and the Holy Ghost are), and Son of God, it is no more than that He should be His own Son, that He should be from everlasting, and yet Son, and no more Sons than He ; no more, than that He is God and the Son of God both. That He only incarnate, never a whit more" difficult ; than that, being the same God, He is neither Father nor Holy Ghost.

§ 33. To answer then this one though great difficulty. First, I insist, that the Socinians, who object it (which may be said of Arius, or Aetius, or whosoever may be found to have objected the like<sup>o</sup>), cannot avoid as great inconveniences if they mean to be Christians. For, the Socinians pretending to honour the Son as the Father<sup>p</sup>, the Arians the Son and the Holy Ghost both<sup>q</sup>, I demand, what greater inconvenience there can be objected to one that pretends to be a Christian, than to give the honour due to God alone to His creature ? than that the Son of God should be God and a creature both ? than that He should create Himself, as both God and creature ? than that, being made a man, He should be exalted to the power and glory of God, whereupon the honour of God becomes due ? If reason and faith agree both together to assure us, that there is a God that made all things, it is not possible that any thing should be imagined more impossible, than that one and the same subject should be truly qualified God and creature. He that can imagine a greater contradiction, a greater inconvenience, a greater inconsistency, than that the same thing should necessarily be what it

CHAP.  
XVII.

[The denial of that mystery far more irreconcilable with reason.]

<sup>o</sup> Added from MS.

<sup>p</sup> " Quod Trinitatis dogma cum sensu communi pugnet," is the title of a section (pp. 65—137, 8vo. 1637) in Schlichtingius, De SS. Trinitate, &c. adv. B. Meisnerum.—That the Arians appealed to logical arguments, and were essentially a sophistical sect, see e.g. Newman, Hist. of Arians, c. i. sect. ii. pp. 28—34. And for Aetius in particular, who was the founder of the Anomæans, he supported his tenets, says Socrates (Hist. Eccl., lib. ii. c. 35. p. 129), "ταῖς κατηγορίαις Ἀριστοτέλους ἐόντων." And see also Epiphanius,

Adv. Hær., lib. ii. tom. ii. Hær. 69. § 15, 69 ; and lib. iii. tom. i. Hær. 76 ; Op., tom. i. pp. 738. C, 739. A, 795, and 912. C, sq.

<sup>q</sup> See above, c. xiv. § 3.

<sup>r</sup> See e.g. the Sermo Arianorum, ap. S. Aug., Op., tom. viii. pp. 621—624. Arius himself speaks of the Son as "πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης Θεός, μονογενής, ἀναλλοίωτος," in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia (ap. Theoderit., Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. 5. p. 21. B, C) ; adding however, that "πρὶν γεννηθῆ ἦτοι κτισθῆ ἢ ὁρισθῆ ἢ θεμελιωθῆ, οὐκ ἦν" (ibid. C).

BOOK II. is, and yet that of itself it may be and may not be what it is; always actually the same, and yet capable of being what it was not sometimes; the cause of all things, and yet depending on that cause which itself is, and so before and after itself: well may he imagine some greater inconvenience than this, that our Lord Christ, made a man as other men are, only conceived by the Holy Ghost without man of a virgin, should be made God, and endued with power and glory, to which the worship and honour of the only true God is due.

[And no way conciliatory of the Jews.]

§ 34. But let them that hope hereby to remove the stumbling block of the Trinity in Unity from before the Jews<sup>r</sup>, consider with themselves, what satisfaction they can hope to give them, or any reasonable creature, by inviting them to give the honour of God to a creature, called God, because of that power and glory which God hath given it above other creatures. For, seeing the same power and glory which God hath given it, He might have given, and (setting aside His declared will to the contrary) may yet give, to as many as the heathen idolaters ever counted gods, how shall he persuade them, that they are the less idolaters, because they do it but to one besides God, and shall never be moved to do it to any more? Whereas, supposing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be one and the same God, we invite them not to worship any but God, though we invite them to worship that which they comprehend not, but believe.

That it is reason to submit to revelation concerning the nature of God.

§ 35. And therefore, for a direct answer to the difficulty made, I must take notice, that there are those<sup>s</sup>, that pretend to make evidence to natural reason, that it is not only consistent with but necessary to the perfection of the Godhead, that, being one and the same singular Being, It hath subsistence in three several Persons: whose opinion and reasons,

<sup>r</sup> So e.g. Smalcus, De Divin. Christi, c. x. pp. 50, 51. Racov. 1608.

<sup>s</sup> Philip Du Plessis Mornay (De Veritate Relig. Christi, c. v. pp. 72—90. Lugd. Bat. 1587; originally written in French), and Ludov. Vives (De Verit. Fidei, lib. ii. tit. De Divina Trinitate, Op., tom. ii. pp. 352—354. Basil. 1555), take this line of argument: both of them however stating the question thus, that reason "*doctrinam, quam nunquam deprehendisset, videt, meditatur, approbat*" (Mornay, *ibid.* p. 73). So also

Moses Amyraldus (De Mystero Trinitatis, P. iii. pp. 143 sq. Salm. 1661), shortly after the publication of Thorndike's book. The original suggestion appears derived from the fathers, and in particular from the tract De Dignitate Humanæ Conditionis attributed to St. Ambrose (c. ii. in append. ad Op., S. Ambrosii, p. 611. B, C). See Pfannerus, Systema Theologiæ Gentilis, c. iii. De Deo Trino, § 5. pp. 139—141. Basil. 1669.



did I write in Latin, I should find myself obliged to consider. C H A P.  
XVII.  
 But the greatest part of those whom I write to not demanding these metaphysics, I will neither censure them, nor hold myself liable to their censure for it, that, by not holding up so high, I betray the advantage of Christianity to the scorn of unbelievers. This I will say, that, speaking of the God-head, it is not necessary to maintain that which I believe to be evidently possible. Which is to say, that I may be bound  
 131 to believe that of God, which I cannot evidence to reason that there is no contradiction in it; because, what the motives of faith make evident that it is revealed, that I am not able to comprehend, how possible or not. For though reason force me to attribute to God all that is of perfection, and to remove from God all that is of imperfection, in the creature; yet by all that I understand nothing proper to God: those things that are revealed, signifying nothing else but His proper nature, incomprehensible to man, till he "see Him as He is." What is the Word and Spirit of God, besides God, I understand not at all; but stick<sup>t</sup> not therefore to believe, that the Word took our flesh, and not the Father, having in It the Holy Ghost without measure, whereof It giveth a certain measure to believers. And had I a proper conceit of that which they express, that which seems a contradiction would then appear necessary.

§ 36. In the mean time, all dispute about essence, and persons, and natures, and all the terms, whereby either the Scriptures express themselves in this point, or the Church excludes the importunities of heresies from the true sense of the Christian faith, improves no man's understanding an inch in this mystery. The service it does, is to teach men the language of the Church, by distinguishing that sense of several sayings which is, and that which is not, consistent with the faith. And if any man hereupon proceed, by discourse upon the nature of the subject, to infer what is and what is not such, his understanding is unsufferable. [Use of  
theological  
terms.]

§ 37. When therefore it is said, the Father is God, the Son God, therefore the Father is the Son; here is nothing like the form of an argument. If, to make an argument in [Reason  
fails here  
from want  
of a proper

<sup>t</sup> Corrected from MS. "let," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.  
conceit of  
the terms  
of the rea-  
soning.]

form, you change it and say, Whosoever is God is the Father, the Son is whosoever is God,—proving both propositions, because the Father is God, as also the Son, and there is but one God, therefore whosoever is God is the Father, therefore the Son is whosoever is God;—here you have recourse to the matter in hand, trusting no more to the form of your argument, but to this consequence, that if there be but one God, and the Father He, then whosoever is God is the Father: which fails; because the revelation which shews the Father to be God, shews the Son to be the same God, which he that did understand God would see to be necessarily consequent. Neither is there cause, that any thing that we see in the creature should make us marvel, why the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being Three Who are God, should not be three Gods, or three substances of the Godhead; unless a man knew what God is, and what the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, import in God. Nor that the same substance should subsist thrice in three Persons; unless he had a proper conceit of that, which person and subsistence signify in the Godhead. Nor shall it follow, that every Person shall be three Persons: because God we know, by discourse from the creature, to be one; but what the Persons are, which we believe to be in God before we think of God, is revealed, because we understand it not. Nor that the Persons can be really the same, because really the same with the same Godhead; because not completely the same with it: which, though by reason not to be understood, grounds the difference between Themselves. For the same reason shall it not follow, that the Son is His own Son; because not Son to the Godhead but to His Father. And therefore but one Son possible; because [Coloss. ii. 9.] “the fulness of the Godhead” is revealed to “dwell bodily” in Christ, [as in<sup>u</sup>] the Father and the Holy Ghost. The Son notwithstanding from everlasting (because in God, in Whom there can be nothing new); though brought forth by an operation, no less from everlasting, than incomprehensible. In fine, the Son alone incarnate, though the Father and the Holy Ghost abide in Him being incarnate; because the Father the fountain, the Holy Ghost the stream that flows

<sup>u</sup> Added from MS.



upon believers: in whom, notwithstanding, the Father and the Son "dwell," John xiv. 23, because they are in the Holy Ghost, Whom the faithful are endowed with. CHAP. XVII.

§ 38. As for that which was feared, that all discourse of reason, all arts and sciences that have come from it, must fail, if we grant not those things which agree or disagree with a third, to agree or disagree one with another<sup>v</sup>; so far it is from holding, that it seems to clear the truth. For if it take place in that discourse which proceeds upon general terms, abstracted from the particulars which we see, then can there be no cause, why it should take place in that which proceeds upon terms revealed from the immediate sight of God, concerning God, Whom we cannot know otherwise. For how should consequences be framed upon terms, whereby the things which they signify are not understood? Therefore all the dispute that the schools can have, of the Holy Trinity, and Incarnation of our Lord Christ, cannot advance us in the understanding of those mysteries; but only teach us, by what terms we may express ourselves in them according to the faith of the Church. And though something evident to reason come in argument with that which is so revealed, yet the effect of the argument must follow the nature of that which is revealed, and pretend no more than I have said. Where, you see, there is nothing to hinder that discourse, which proceeds upon that which men understand of things subject to sense (by considering that wherein particulars differ, and that wherein they agree), to take effect no less, than if nothing were revealed.

The use of reason in no way renounced by holding this faith.

<sup>v</sup> Above, § 32.

BOOK  
II.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

133

THE NECESSITY OF THE GRACE OF CHRIST IS THE EVIDENCE OF ORIGINAL SIN. HOW THE EXALTATION OF OUR LORD DEPENDS UPON HIS HUMILIATION, AND THE GRACE OF CHRIST UPON THAT. ALL THE WORK OF CHRISTIANITY IS ASCRIBED TO THE GRACE OF CHRIST. GOD'S PREDESTINATION MANIFESTETH THE SAME.

The necessity of the grace of Christ is the evidence of original sin.

THESE things thus premised, the evidence which I make for original sin from the grace of Christ, as for the grace of Christ from original sin, consists in this proposition; that not only the preaching of the Gospel, but also the effect of it, in converting us both to the profession and conversation of Christians, is granted in consideration of the obedience of Christ for the cure of that wound which the disobedience of Adam made.

§ 2. Here I must note, that the conversation of Christians, as it requireth and presupposeth the profession of Christianity, so it comprehendeth all parts and offices of a man's life, to be guided and led according to that will and law of God which His word declareth: so that, to prove my intent, it will be requisite to shew, that it is through those helps which the grace of God by Christ (that is, in consideration of His obedience and sufferings) furnisheth, that any part of a man's duty is discharged like a Christian; which otherwise would have been employed to the satisfaction of those inclinations, which the corruption of man's nature by the fall of Adam hath brought forth.

[The Epistle to the Romans.]

§ 3. This to do, I will begin as afore<sup>x</sup> with the Epistle to the Romans. In the beginning whereof St. Paul, having proved (that which Pelagius and Socinus both allow) that there is no salvation without Christianity, and coming to render a reason for the necessity thereof from those things which I pressed afore<sup>y</sup> concerning the disobedience of Adam, proceeds to maintain it by the antithesis of Christ's obedience, thus, Rom. v. 15—19. Having begun to say, that Adam "is the figure of Him that was to come,"—"But the grace is not as the transgression. For if by one man's transgression many are dead, much more hath the grace of God, and gift through

[Rom. v. 14.]

<sup>x</sup> c. x. § 8.

<sup>y</sup> c. x. § 8—10.



the grace of one Man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. Nor is the gift as that which came by one that sinned ; for judgment came of one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many transgressions to righteousness. For if by one man's transgression death reigned through one, much more shall they, who receive the abundance of the grace and the gift of righteousness, reign in life through One, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the transgression of one," the matter proceeded "to condemnation upon all, so by the righteousness of One, [upon all] to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One many shall be made righteous." Here, whosoever acknowledgeth, that righteousness comes by Christ (which "the free gift that brings from many transgressions to righteousness," and "the abundance of the grace and gift of righteousness unto life," manifestly argues), can neither refuse the contrary unrighteousness, which causeth condemnation and death, to come from 'Adam's sin ;' nor yet the grace which voids it (called by St. Paul "the gift which comes through the grace of one Man Jesus Christ," that is, that grace which He hath obtained with God), to be granted in consideration of Christ ; through Whom, the Apostle says, "they that receive the gift of righteousness shall reign in life." For how shall they "reign in life through Him," and "through the gift of righteousness," but that through Him they receive the gift of righteousness ? Therefore St. Paul, lamenting afterwards the conflict between sin and grace, Rom. vii. 22—25 : "I am content with the law of God according to the inward man ; but I see another law in my members, warring with the law of my mind, and captivating me to the law of sin that is in my members : wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ? I thank God through our

134 Lord Jesus Christ : " to wit, because from God, in consideration of Jesus Christ and His obedience (and not only through the doctrine which He taught), he had help to overcome in so great a conflict. Wherefore it followeth immediately, Rom. viii. 1—4 : "There is therefore now no more condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit ; for the law of the spirit of life

1st Jesus hath freed me from the law of sin and death :

BOOK  
II.

for whereas the inability of the law was weak through the flesh, God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, that walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." Whether you understand "the law of the spirit of life," or "life," to come in "by" (or "through") Christ Jesus; if we be freed from the law of sin and death by Christ, then by the helps God gives in consideration of His obedience. For how is sin "condemned in the flesh," but because it is executed? And how executed, but because we are enabled to put it to death? And how by Christ's death, but by the helps which God grants in consideration of it? Therefore it followeth a little after: "If a man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not His; but if Christ be in you, the body is dead indeed because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness: but if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, through His Spirit that dwelleth in you." That Spirit, which makes righteousness a law to us by Christ, shall raise again these mortal bodies, which shall be destroyed because of sin. So, as our rising from death is purchased by the resurrection of Christ, so our rising from sin by His death, which purchased His rising again.

How the exaltation of our Lord depends upon His humiliation, and the grace of Christ upon that.

[“ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα.”]

§ 4. For consider what St. Paul writes again of our Lord Christ, Phil. ii. 5—11. "Let that sense be in you that was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, made it no occasion of pride that He was equal with God; but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, becoming in the likeness of man; and being found in habit as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: therefore God also hath overexalted Him, and given Him the Name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess to the glory of God the Father, that Jesus Christ is the Lord." Where, seeing it is manifest by the premises, that our humbling of ourselves is, with God, the consideration upon which He promises to exalt us (being, as hath appeared, the condition of the covenant of grace), it α



be denied, that the humiliation of Christ was the consideration for which He was exalted. Neither is it any difficulty, that Christ could not be exalted to any eminence, that should not be due to Him as God in man's flesh; and, therefore, that which was due to Him as incarnate, could not be due to His cross. For the assumption of man's nature being a work of God, and not of nature, the state which our Lord Christ was to assume in our nature, was not determinable any way but by the voluntary appointment of God and the Father, Who ordered it: so that nothing hindered the effects of the Holy Ghost, dwelling in our Lord Christ without measure, to be exercised in such measure and upon such reasons as God should appoint; nor the declaration of the fulness of the Godhead, dwelling in our flesh, to depend upon His obedience and suffering in it. The declaration hereof is that which St. Paul calls that "Name above all names, at which all things bow;" which the giving of the Holy Ghost to our Lord Christ, to convince the world of it, upon His exaltation, is that which effecteth. So saith St. Peter, Acts ii. 33: "Being therefore exalted to the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost of the Father, He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." For it is true, our Lord promised His disciples the Holy Ghost: John xiv. 16—18; xvi. 7, 13—15. But this promise He received upon His advancement to the right hand of God, being then and thereupon enabled to perform it. And, therefore, it is that which our Lord signifies, Matt. xxviii. 18, [19]: when He says, "All power is given to Me in heaven and upon earth; go ye therefore, and make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." For the event shews, that this power consists in sending the Holy Ghost, whereby the world was reduced to the obedience of the Christian faith: so that, when our Lord says (Matt. xi. 27), "All things are delivered unto Me by the Father," He means the right to this power, though limited in the exercise of it unto the time and state of His advancement, which gave Him right in it. And though it be granted, as I said afore<sup>2</sup>, that the general terms of "all power in heaven and earth," and "all things," are to be

<sup>2</sup> Above, c. xiv. § 5.

BOOK  
II.

understood of that which concerns His kingdom; yet, seeing the ground thereof (consisting in giving such measure of the Holy Ghost to His disciples as the advancement of His kingdom requires) supposes the fulness thereof to dwell in His own flesh, it imports no disparagement to the Godhead of Christ, that the exercise thereof in our flesh is limited to that time, and that state of His advancement, which the Father appointeth. St. Paul, Ephes. iv. 7—11, writeth thus: “Now to every one of us is grace given according to the measure of God’s gift” (to wit, in which God pleased to give it); “therefore He saith, Going up on high He led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men: now, that He ascended, what is it but that He descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same Who also ascended far above all heavens, that He might fill all things: and He hath given some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors.” Where it is manifest, that he sets forth the ascension of our Lord in the nature of a triumph after the victory of His cross; as conquerors lead captives in triumph, and give largesses to their subjects and soldiers. And that which St. Paul terms “giving gifts to men,” David, out of whom it is quoted (Ps. lxxviii. 18), calls “receiving gifts for men;” our Lord being His Father’s general, and by His commission conquering in His name. Receiving therefore of Him Who gave Him commission, the gifts which He bestows at His triumph, can any man doubt, that He receives them in consideration of the discharge of that commission which He undertook? And these gifts are the means, by which the Gospel convicteth the world, and taketh effect in it.

[The same appears by the conquest of Christ’s cross.]

[Coloss. ii. 14.]

§ 5. The same appears by the conquest of Christ’s cross, and those Scriptures that speak of it. Col. ii. 15; “Disarming principalities and powers, He made an open shew of them, triumphing over them through it:” to wit, His cross; to which he had said just afore, that He “nailed” the decrees of the Law “that were against us.” Heb. ii. 14, [15]; “Seeing then that sons partake of flesh and blood, He also likewise did partake of the same, that by death He might destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil, and free as many, as through fear of death were all their life long sub-



ject unto bondage." 1 Cor. xv. 54—57: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality, then shall that come to pass which is written, Death is swallowed up in victory: death, where is thy sting? hell, where is thy victory? the sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the Law; but thanks be to the Lord, Which giveth us victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." How doth God grant victory by our Lord Jesus Christ? Are we not, and He, several persons by nature? the conflicts several? What doth His<sup>a</sup> conquest contribute to ours, but by enabling us to overcome? How that, but by the help of God granted in consideration of it? How are slaves to the fear of death freed from death by Christ's death, but because "there is no condemnation for them that live by the Spirit" of life, granted them in consideration of His death? And what is the triumph of the cross over the powers of darkness but this, that by the means of it they are disabled to keep mankind prisoners as afore? And wherein consists the condemning or the executing of sin in the flesh, which St. Paul spake of afore, but in this, that by the death of Christ we are enabled to put it to death? The parable of our Saviour is manifest in this, that as the branches bear fruit by being in the vine, that is, of it, so Christians by being in Christ (John xv. 1—8); and that force, by virtue whereof they bear it, not being conveyed but by God's appointment, why God had appointed the merits and sufferings of Christ to go before  
136 this conveyance, but to procure it, is not reasonable. Therefore our Lord, John viii. 31, [32, 34—] 36: "If ye abide in My word, ye shall be My disciples indeed, and shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free:" and again; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that every man that sinneth is a slave to sin; now the slave abideth not for ever in the house, but the son for ever; if therefore the son set you free, you shall be free indeed." The Son of God sets free the slaves of sin: not as the sons of men, by the death of their fathers becoming heirs, and granting freedom to whom they please; but by dying Himself, and by His death helping them to their freedom. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 14; "The natural man admitteth not the things of God's Spirit, for

<sup>a</sup> Corrected from MS. "this," in orig. text.

BOOK  
II.

they are folly to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned:" to wit, by that Spirit, which Christ purchased the gift of by His cross. And why should the soul of man take that for "folly," which God's Spirit revealeth, were there not a principle bred in our nature, to determine all men's inclinations to this general resistance? Again, the same St. Paul, teaching them not to think of themselves what the word of God allows not, 1 Cor. iv. 7; "For who distinguisheth thee? or what hast thou that thou hast not received? but if thou hast received it, why boastest thou, as if thou hadst not received it?" Here, if it be said, that the speech is of the office of apostles and the like, and the graces requisite to the discharge of them, which are graces tending to the common benefit of the Church, not to the salvation of those particular persons to whom they are given<sup>b</sup>; the answer is evident,—that St. Paul speaks not of those graces, but of the right use of them: as it appears by the beginning of the chapter; "So let a man account us, as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God; now in stewards it is required, that a man be found faithful." And this fidelity it is, in which the Apostle appeals to God, and wisheth them not 'to judge before God,' nor "to think of themselves above what is written;" because, as they have it not but from God, and therefore not to boast of, so they have it not to the purpose, but when God discerneth and alloweth it to be in them.

[1 Cor. iv.  
1, 2.][1 Cor. iv.  
5, 6.]

§ 6. And if it be said<sup>c</sup>, that it is manifest indeed, by innu-

<sup>b</sup> "Jam quod Apostolus nostram sufficientiam ex Deo esse, nosque, qui aliquid per nos ipsos cogitemus, minime esse idoneos asserit; item quod Corinthios admonet, ne illis gloriantur quæ aliunde habent; id nimirum ad rem nihil quicquam pertinet; cum neque hic neque illic de fide Evangelio adhibenda aut obedientia Deo præstanda agatur; sed in illo quidem loco de rebus ad munus Apostolicum pertinentibus, qualis erat Corinthiorum ad fidem conversio; in hoc vero de Spiritus Sancti donis aliisque charismatis et eorum effectis, quæ nonnullis Corinthiorum magnos fecerant spiritus." Volk., *De Vera Relig.*, lib. v. c. xviii. p. 555.

<sup>c</sup> "Demonstrabimus nequaquam

hominis voluntatem ita adstrictam esse, quin possit velle aut nolle aliquid facere in rebus ad religionem salutemque æternam spectantibus, et porro etiam, ubi Evangelicam doctrinam auribus perceperit, reipsa credere, ac Dei præceptis Ipsius ope accedente parere." Id., *ibid.*, p. 544.—"Duplici porro ratione Deus hominum conatibus opitulatur: quarum altera externa est, et vel in minando vel in promittendo consistit; . . altera vero internum auxilium est, quod tunc nobis Deus affert, cum vel promissa, nobis facta ac externis documentis confirmata, animis nostris Divina virtute penitus insculpit. pleniori voluntatis Suae notitia struit." Id., *ibid.*, p. 546.—"fides ac obedientia earumque rei



merable passages of the Apostles (of which divers have been produced afore<sup>d</sup>), that the Holy Ghost is granted to those that truly believe, to dwell with them, and to enable them to perform what they have undertaken in professing themselves Christians; and, before that, the Holy Ghost is granted indeed to those who preach the Gospel, apostles, evangelists, prophets, and the like, to enable them to convince the world, that the Gospel which they preach comes from God, and that it is to be embraced; but that it is not the Holy Ghost, but their own free choice, that determines them to adhere to that, which the Holy Ghost convinceth them that they ought to adhere to: I say, for the present, it is enough for me to shew by the Scriptures, that the conviction which the Gospel tenders is from the Holy Ghost, the gift whereof the obedience of our Lord Christ hath purchased. There will follow enough to shew, that the effect of this conviction, to wit, conversion, is from the same grace. In the meantime, mark, why our Lord challengeth the Pharisees and scribes of the "sin against the Holy Ghost," Mark iii. 28—30: "All sins shall be forgiven the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith they shall blaspheme; but whoso shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath no forgiveness for ever, but is guilty of everlasting judgment; because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." Where, not to dispute at present, why the blasphemies against the Holy Ghost cannot be remitted when all other sins are, I challenge this to be evident in the words of the Gospel, that their blasphemy against the Holy Ghost consisted in this, that, though convicted that they were God's works which our Saviour did, yet they said, that He did them by the devil. I acknowledge it is the same crime, when they who have "tasted the heavenly gift, and are become partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have relished the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come," do "fall away;" Heb. vi. 4—6: but with this difference, that these are convict by their profession, the other only by their conscience; God only knowing that

CHAP.  
XVIII.

[Conversion, as well as perseverance in the Christian calling, is from the Holy Ghost.]

luntas non ex nobis sed ex Deo esse dicatur, satis est, nos non ultro, ac nemine monente, sed nonnisi Deo auctore, nobis licet eo benedictis, etiamque nos ea de re

cogitationem suscepisse et animum ac voluntatem nostram ad eam rem applicuisse." Id., *ibid.*, p. 555.—And see the whole chapter.

<sup>d</sup> c. ii. § 7—10.

BOOK  
II.

hardness of heart, wherewith they resisted that conviction, which the Holy Ghost in our Lord Christ tendered: these, by professing themselves Christians (who are promised the Holy Ghost to dwell in them if their profession be sincere),<sup>137</sup> acknowledging that they transgress the dictate of it. Hereupon St. Stephen, speaking by the Holy Ghost, and doing signs and miracles to convince the Jews that so he did (Acts vi. 8, 10), justly charges them (Acts vii. 51), "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in hearts and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, even ye, as your fathers." And therefore, our Saviour having said in one place (Apoc. iii. 20), "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if a man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with Me;" in another (John xiv. 23), "If a man love Me, he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him, and make abode with him:" as it cannot be denied, that the Holy Ghost, and in Him the Father and the Son, dwell in him that loves Christ; no more can it be denied, that Christ knocks at the door of the hearts of them that give Him entrance, to make them so to love Him, that He takes up His lodging in their hearts.

All the  
work of  
Christiani-  
ty is ascrib-  
ed to the  
grace of  
Christ.

§ 7. Add we now to the premises the words of our Lord in the parable of the vine, John xv. 5; "Without Me ye can do nothing:" the words of the Apostle, 2 Cor. iii. 4—6; "We have this confidence towards God, not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God; Who hath also made us sufficient ministers of the New Testament, not the letter but the spirit:" remembering what I said afore<sup>e</sup>, that this extends not only to the grace of an apostle, but to the right use of it. Of which right use the same Apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 10; "By the grace of God I am what I am, and His grace towards me was not in vain, but I laboured more than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me." And again, of the whole business, Phil. ii. 12, 13: "Wherefore, my beloved, . . . work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do;" to wit, by the Holy Ghost Which Christ send<sup>e</sup>

<sup>e</sup> § 5.



from the beginning to the end of the work of Christianity. And Ephes. ii. 8—10: "For by grace ye are saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is God's gift, not of works, that no man may boast; for we are His making, created by Jesus Christ for good works, which God hath prepared afore for us to walk in." By the grace of the Holy Ghost, which we receive upon becoming Christians, not by the works of the Law (though it be also the same grace that makes us Christians), by this grace are we saved. Therefore St. Paul again, Phil. i. 6; "Having this very confidence, that He who hath begun a good work in you will complete it unto the day of Christ Jesus." And our Lord, John vi. 37, 44: "Whatsoever My Father giveth Me, shall come to Me;" and, "No man can come to Me unless My Father that sent Me draw him." And the Apostle, 1 John iv. 19; "We love Him because He loved us first," [James i. 17]; "Every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with Whom is no change or shadow of turning." Gal. vi. 3; "If any man think himself something, being nothing, he deceives himself." Heb. xiii. 21; God "make you of one mind in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is acceptable before Him through Jesus Christ:" to wit, by the means of His Spirit. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10: it is God, "That hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but His own purpose, and grace given us through Christ Jesus before eternal times, but now manifested by the appearance of our Saviour Jesus Christ, having abolished death, but shined forth life and incorruption by the Gospel." The abolishing of death and the declaration of eternal life, wherein the calling of men to Christianity consists, together with the saving of us, which is effected by means of the Son; how these things come by Christ, we learn from His words, John xii. 24, 31—33: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a grain of wheat fall not into the earth and die, it remaineth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit;" and, "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast forth; and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men

Me: this He said signifying what death He should die:"

signifying also, what should be the force and effect of

BOOK  
II.

that death. Then those Scriptures, which make charity to be the gift of God and of the Holy Ghost: [1] John iv. 7; Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 31, xiii. 1; Gal. v. 22: which Holy Ghost our Lord Christ by His death hath obtained for us, as afore<sup>f</sup>.

God's pre-  
destination  
manifest-  
eth the  
same.

§ 8. Unto all which I will add, in the last place, those which speak of the predestination of God; as it signifies no more than the preparation of that grace from everlasting, whereby we are saved in time. St. Paul indeed, when he excludes the presumption which the Jews had of being saved by the Law (as the fathers, they thought, were), distinguishing between the seed of Abraham according to the flesh and according to promise, Rom. ix. 6—13 (which promise he supposes to be the forerunner of Christ's Gospel), manifestly declares no more than the question which he is there engaged in requires him to declare: to wit, that they were not saved by virtue of the Law, but by virtue of that grace which now the Gospel openly tendereth. So that, Israel and Esau holding the figure of the Jews (that expected to be saved by the works of the Law), Isaac and Jacob consequently answer the Christians; who expect salvation, not by their birth, but by God's promise, "not by works, but by Him that calleth;" to wit, to the said promise. Whereby it appeareth, that the words of the prophet which he allegeth, "Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated," signify no more, according to the spiritual sense of the Old Testament which the New Testament yieldeth, but the accepting of the Church instead of the synagogue, of the Christians instead of the Jews; and that this is "the purpose of God according to choice," which St. Paul speaks of immediately afore: inasmuch as God purposed from the beginning (when first He took the seed of Abraham from among the nations, to place His name among them), that His choice ones, of Isaac's posterity as well as Abraham's, should be those that bore the figure of the Christian Church promised afore, and born upon the promise that they should be beloved. All this being granted (which I count most true and undeniable), notwithstanding, "the purpose of God according to choice," as it expresses a declaration of receiving the Church instead of the synagogue, so it implies and presupposes a purpose of

[Mal. i. 2,  
3; Rom.  
ix. 13.]

[Rom. ix.  
11.]

<sup>f</sup> Above, § 2—5.



God, to make and to build Christ's mystical Body, which is the Church; upon which purpose of God all those prophecies are grounded, whereby God foretelleth of His new people Israel according to the Spirit, which Christians know to be those children which He raised up to Abraham out of the stones. For we cannot think so slightly of God's providence, that, by foretelling this secret, He obliges Himself only to find sufficient means to convert men to Christianity; but also, those which should take effect, and bring to pass the conversion of the world to Christianity by the Gospel of Christ. Seeing then, that the Church is nothing but the souls whereof it consisteth; and that the foreknowing and the foretelling of the Church, which Christians believe to be fulfilled, consisteth in foreknowing and foretelling the conversion of those persons, who have constituted and shall constitute the number of believers from the preaching of Christianity till the world's end; it followeth, that this "purpose of God according to election" can no way stand, without an intent of God to bring the said election (that is, this multitude of God's choice ones) to Christianity, whether by the preaching of the Gospel, or by the helps which depend thereupon, as it depends upon Christ's death.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

[Matt. iii.  
9; Luke  
iii. 8.]

§ 9. And this is most manifest by St. Paul's answer to an objection, which follows upon his conclusion of this point: that, if God hath mercy upon whom He pleaseth, and pardons whom He pleaseth, He has no cause to complain of any man (to wit, of the Jews who believe not), because no man can "resist His will;" that is to say, because He is able to convert them if He please. Which inference St. Paul (not denying that God could convert the unbelieving Jews if He pleased) thus avoideth: "Nay, O man, who art thou that disputest with God? shall the pot say to the potter, Why hast thou made me thus?" and afore; "What shall we say then? is there injustice with God? God forbid; for He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I compassionate; so it is not in the willing, nor in the running, but in God that shews mercy:" Rom. ix. 18—20, 14—16. Where it is plain, that St. Paul no way denies the truth of the assumption, that God may, if He please, employ such means as shall make

[Exod.  
xxxiii. 19.]

BOOK  
II.

any man a Christian. How he avoids the consequence, is another matter, and not belonging to this dispute; inasmuch as it is manifest to all that understand learning, that it is one thing to prove a truth, another to clear the objections that lie against it. That I shall endeavour to do, before I leave the business<sup>g</sup>. In this, I shall think thus much evidenced by the premises: that God, Who knew (from the beginning of the sending of Christ, and enabling His Apostles and their successors of the Church to convict the world of it), who should obey the Gospel and who not, did so order the means by which this obedience was effected or not, that He might know that it would or would not come to pass; and, this preaching of the Gospel and the means and consequence of it being granted in consideration of Christ, that the reason why such means was requisite, is to be drawn from the fall of Adam and the corruption of man's nature by it.

[Our  
Lord's  
words to  
a similar  
purpose.]

§ 10. And to this sense seem the words of our Lord to belong, John x. 28, 29: "I give My sheep eternal life, nor shall they ever perish, nor any man snatch them out of My hand; My Father who gave Me them is greatest of all, nor can any man snatch them out of My Father's hand." Although it seems, that He enlargeth the same sense to another effect, John xvii. 6—12: "I have manifested Thy name to the men whom Thou gavest Me out of the world; Thine they were, and Me Thou gavest them, and they have kept Thy Word: now know they, that whatsoever Thou gavest Me is from Thee; for the words that Thou gavest Me have I given them, and they have received them, and know of a truth, that I am come forth from Thee, and . . Thou hast sent Me: I ask for them, I ask not for the world, but for those that Thou hast given Me, for they are Thine; and all Mine are Thine, and Thine Mine, and I am glorified in them; and I am no more in the world, but they are in the world, and I come to Thee: holy Father, keep them in Thy Name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one as We: when I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy Name; these whom Thou gavest Me I kept, nor is any of them lost but the son of perdition, that the Scripture may be fulfilled." For afterwards it is said, that our Lord spake to those that

<sup>g</sup> See below, c. xxiv.



apprehended Him, to let His disciples go; "that the word which He had said might be fulfilled, I have lost none of those whom Thou gavest Me:" John xviii. 9. But all this will not serve to make us believe, that His then disciples alone were the men that the Father gave to Christ; He having said expressly afterwards, John xvii. 20, "I ask not for these alone, but for those that shall believe in Me through their word." For this shews, that He prays for His then disciples in the common quality of disciples, that is, of Christians; having other prayers to make for the world, that is, for those that were not: as we see by and by, John xvii. 21, and Luke xxiii. 34. But in that He saith so often, that "the Father had given them Him," from Whose appointment the sufferings of Christ, the power which He is advanced to, the success of the Gospel which He publisheth, dependeth; in that regard, I conceive the helps of God's grace by the second Adam, whereby the breach made by the first is repaired, necessarily to be implied in God's giving unto our Lord Christ His disciples.

§ 11. And of this sense, much there is expressed by St. Paul, Ephes. i. 3—11. "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, That hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavens through Christ: as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before Him in love; having foreappointed us to adoption to Himself, through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of His will; to the praise of His glorious grace, whereby He made us acceptable in the Beloved; through Whom we have redemption by His blood, even the remission of sins, according to the riches of His grace, which hath abounded to us in all wisdom and prudence: having made known to us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in Himself, at the dispensation of the fulness of times to restore all things, both in heaven and in earth, through Christ; in Whom also we have received our lots, appointed according to the purpose of Him That effects all things according to the counsel of His will." For, not to insist upon the force of those terms and phrases which St. Paul uses, whatsoever blessings it may be said St. Paul hereby signifies to have

CHAP.  
XVIII.

[And St. Paul's in the Epistle to the Ephesians.]

BOOK II. been appointed to the Ephesians from everlasting as Christians, I suppose it cannot be denied, that he presupposes, that they were also appointed from everlasting to be Christians; to whom, by so being, those blessings should become due. And all this so many times, and so manifestly, said to have been appointed in Christ, or by Christ, or through Christ, that it cannot be questioned, that not only the Gospel, by which they were brought to that estate, but also the means that enforce it, and the consequences whereby it takes effect, all depend upon Christ, and the consideration of His coming to destroy the works of the devil in our first parents.

## CHAPTER XIX.

EVIDENCES OF THE SAME IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. OF GOD'S HELP IN GETTING THE LAND OF PROMISE; AND RENEWING THE COVENANT; AND THAT FOR CHRIST'S SAKE. THAT CHRISTIANITY CANNOT STAND WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGING THE GRACE OF CHRIST. THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH: IN THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS; IN THE PRAYERS OF THE CHURCH; IN THE DECREES AGAINST PELAGIUS, AND OTHER RECORDS OF THE CHURCH.

Evidences  
of the same  
in the Old  
Testament.

It remaineth now, that I shew how the same truth is signified to us in the Old Testament; whereof I will point out three sorts of passages, tending to prove it, and when they are put together, making full evidence of it.

1. Of God's  
help in get-  
ting the  
land of  
promise.

§ 2. The first is of those, wherein it is acknowledged, that the inheritance of the land of promise is not to be ascribed to any merit or force of their own, but to the goodness and assistance of God: than which nothing can be produced out of the New Testament more effectual, to shew, that whatsoever tends to bring Christians to the kingdom of heaven is to be ascribed to the grace of God; there being the same correspondence between the helps of spiritual grace whereby Christians overcome their spiritual enemies, and the help of God whereby the Israelites overcame the seven nations, as between the kingdom of heaven and the land of promise: and, therefore, all those promises whereby God assures them of deliverance from their enemies, and maintenance in the



possession thereof, all acknowledgments of God's free gift whereby they held that inheritance, argue no less concerning those helps, whereby the children of the Church (answering to the land of Canaan here) are enabled to continue true spiritual members thereof, and to attain the land of promise that is above. I shall not need to produce many particulars of this nature, whereof all the Old Testament affordeth good store. That of Moses, Deut. ix. 3—8, I must not forget; where, assuring them of God to go along with them, he warns them not to ascribe that favour to their own righteousness (though he acknowledgeth that God employs them to punish the seven nations), but to His covenant with their fathers. And that God enabled them to cast out those nations, which were greater and stronger than themselves, it is oftentimes said there: Deut. iv. 37, 38; vii. 1; ix. 1; xi. 23. And this David sets forth, Psalm xlv., as the ground of the prayer which he makes, that God would shew them the like grace in their present distress; which is the whole business of the same. And the like you may see Psalm cxliv., and in many other Psalms; if the very story of their coming out of Egypt were not evidence beyond all evidence for this.

§ 3. But there is besides, in the Old Testament, another sort of sayings and sentences, of prayers and promises and thanksgivings; whereby the inward and spiritual obedience and worship of God (which the law of Moses covertly intimateth, though expressly it do not covenant for it, as I have shewed<sup>b</sup>) is either on man's part acknowledged to the grace of God, or on God's part promised to men that are qualified for it at that time under the Law, correspondently to those dispositions, which qualify us under the Gospel for the like promises. And, to say truth, in these intimations of the worship and service of God in spirit and truth, required, assisted, or rewarded, in the Old Testament, lies the effect and truth of that which hath been so often said, that the New Testament is contained, though darkly, in it<sup>c</sup>: and those, who by the light of that time were reduced under this obedience, are the men whom St. Augustin speaks of divers times<sup>d</sup>, that, though

CHAP.  
XIX.

[Ps. xlv.  
1—3.]

2. And[in]  
renewing  
the cove-  
nant.

<sup>b</sup> Above, cc. v. § 10, viii. § 2, 5—17.

<sup>c</sup> See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. v. § 33. note b; and above, c. viii.

§ 14. note c.

<sup>d</sup> "Viri sancti et justi, qui licet illo tempore fuerint, ad Novum tamen per-

BOOK II. they lived under the Old Testament, yet they belonged to the New: and Eusebius<sup>k</sup>, and divers of the fathers besides, when they insist upon this against the Jews, that Christianity is more ancient than the law of Moses. It is neither possible, nor requisite, to repeat here all of this nature, that is found in the Old Testament. Something for an essay I shall produce; that the reader may know by them, what passages of the Old Testament they are upon which I understand this point of Christianity to be grounded. I cannot name any thing more eminent than that promise of God by the prophet Jeremy, xxxi. 31—34 (which the Apostle hath expounded of the times of the Gospel, Heb. viii. 8—[13], but, by the rule afore laid and grounded<sup>l</sup>, must have been fulfilled in the return of the people from the captivity, though more perfectly and in a higher sense in the redemption from sin): whereby God promiseth to make a new covenant with them (which is no more than the renewing of the old), under which they should not need to be taught to know God, because they should have His law written in their hearts; as of a truth we know they did not fall away any more unto idols. The like promises you have, Jer. xxxii. 37—41; xxxi. 1—3; Isai. ii. 1—4; Micah iv. 1—5; Ezek. xvi. 60; xi. 17—21; xxxvi. 21—29: and the fulfilling of them, at least in part, and according to the measure of that time, in the renewing of the covenant, Nehem. x. I must write out a great part of the Book of Psalms, if I would repeat here the many prayers and praises of God, which are tendered in it, not only for the temporal estate of David, and the maintenance of it against the enemies of his title to the kingdom, but for the grace, whereby he, and every good Christian, is either enlightened in the

tinent Testamentum." S. Aug., Cont. Faustum, lib. xxii. c. 84; Op., tom. viii. p. 413. D.—"Illi omnes (Moyses cæterique Prophetæ), etsi pro temporis dispensatione Veteris Testamenti ministrabant figuris, ad Novum tamen Testamentum, quamvis nondum revelatum, per gratiam Dei pertinebant." Id., Cont. Adversar. Legis et Proph., lib. ii. c. 8. § 30; *ibid.*, p. 597. C.—"Sed quia in eo præfigurabatur Novum, qui hoc intelligebant tunc homines Dei, secundum distributionem temporum Veteris quidem Testamenti dispensatores et gestatores, sed Novi demon-

strantur hæredes." Id., Cont. Duas Epist. Pelagianor., lib. iii. c. 4. § 6: *ibid.*, tom. x. p. 450. F.—And elsewhere repeatedly.

<sup>k</sup> "Τοιοῦτος δὲ πῆφηνεν ὁ πρὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ νενομοθετημένος νόμος τε καὶ βίος, τὴν παλαιότητα καὶ πρεσβυτέραν Μώσεως εὐσέβειαν ἀναγεούμενος, καθ' ἣν ὁ θεοφιλὴς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ τούτου προπάτορες δέκνυνται πεπολιτευμένοι." Euseb., Dem. Evang., lib. i. c. 5. p. 9. C. Paris. 1628: and see the whole chapter.

<sup>l</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 38; and above, c. xvi. § 2.



knowledge of God's law (to wit, according to the inward and spiritual intent of it), or guided in it and enabled to keep it. CHAP. XIX.

The cxixth. alone may serve for the rest. But you read besides every where; "Mine eyes are ever looking to the Lord, for He shall pluck my feet out of the net—the Lord ordereth a good man's going, and maketh his way acceptable to Himself—Thy loving-kindness shall follow me all the days of my life." And, much more to the same purpose, the prayer of David at the consecrating of his and the princes' goods to the building of the temple, 1 Chron. xxix. 10—20: for he thanks God, not only for the gold and silver which they had to bestow, but for the good heart they bestowed it with; and prays, not only that Solomon might build it, but that he might live in obedience to God's law.

§ 4. In the third place, there are some prophecies concerning the Messias, intimating the kingdom which God designed for Him to stand upon His obedience tendered to God; which is as much, to them that believe this kingdom to consist in the spiritual obedience which Christians render His Gospel, as that the helps which enable them to render this obedience are granted in consideration of His. Ps. xlv. 8; "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God even Thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." The anointing of Christ is His advancement; therefore "the oil of gladness," which He is anointed with, containeth those graces which He is enabled to bestow upon it. The 'sword which He girds upon His thigh,' the 'prosperous' course in which He 'rides on,' the 'sharpness of His arrows,' entering into the bowels of His enemies, and the subduing them to Him (which are the means by which He reigns over those to whom God hath anointed Him king), must be imputed to that obedience, for which He is "anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows." The like is to be said of the conquest of Christ, and the conflict whereby it is obtained, Ps. cx.:

142 "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit Thou at My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." Here is Christ anointed. But when it follows by and by; "He shall judge among the Gentiles, He shall fill all with corpses, He shall wound the [Ps. cx. 1.]  
[Ps. cx. 6, 7.]  
at land; He shall drink of the

[Ps. xxv. 14; xxxvii. 23; xxiii. 6. Prayer-bk. vers.]

3. And that for Christ's sake.

[Prayer-bk. vers.]

[Ps. xlv. 3—5.]

[Ps. cx. 6, 7.]

BOOK II. brook in the way, therefore shall He lift up the head :” it

must needs be understood, that He fights God’s battles in all this, and that therefore He is ‘exalted to the right hand of God, till His enemies be made His footstool.’ But there is nothing more manifest than that of Isai. liii. 10—12 : “When Thou shalt make Him a trespass offering, He shall see a seed, He shall prolong His days, and the good pleasure of the Lord shall prosper under His hand ; He shall see and be satisfied of the travail of His soul ; by His knowledge shall My righteous Servant make many righteous, for He shall bear their iniquities : therefore will I divide Him a share among the great ones, and He shall part the spoil with the strong ; because He poured forth His soul to death, and was numbered among rebels, and bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the rebels.” This, as it is the clearest prophecy of the cross of Christ in all the Old Testament, so it speaks most expressly of the Christian Church, to be raised and gathered in consideration of the sufferings of Christ, and the help of that grace, which they have purchased at God’s hands that He should give. And they who believe all the deliverances of God’s ancient people to have been figures hereof, and read their bringing out of Egypt into the land of promise, and the maintenance of them in the inheritance thereof (notwithstanding their enemies, yea, notwithstanding their frequent transgressing of it), imputed to the covenant with their fathers, (believing with St. Paul, that all God’s promises are “yea and amen in Christ,”) they cannot consequently make doubt to believe, not only that they are spiritually made good to Christians, but also were spiritually made good to them who lived the life of Christians under the faith of Christ to come, during the Law, in consideration of His merits and sufferings.

[2 Cor. i. 20.]

§ 5. And, therefore, it is not for nothing that I insist upon this ; that not only the giving of the Law, but the ambassages by which God dealt with the fathers and prophets of old time, were performed by the same “Word of God,” Which afterwards becoming incarnate is now our Lord Christ, assuming for the time the ministry of an angel, that represented and bore the person of God in the likeness of man ; as prefaces and preludes to His coming in our flesh not to leave it any

[The Word of God appearing to the fathers and prophets under the Old Testament.]



more<sup>m</sup>. For if it pleased God to use this ministry in order to that, which was to purchase of Him that grace which should build the Church; is it marvel, if, in consideration of His Son, by Whom this intercourse between God and man was managed, He should grant those helps at that time, which (by the means of that knowledge which that intercourse maintained) were effectual to reduce them to that spiritual obedience to God, which made them friends to God at that time?

§ 6. And therefore I marvel not, that the ancient Church, [The Apocrypha.] according to that which I said afore<sup>n</sup>, should make use of those books which now we call Apocrypha, for the instruction of those whom by the name of *catechumeni* they prepared for baptism. For, inasmuch as we have in them those express testimonies which I have quoted, of the Wisdom of God dealing with mankind from the fall of Adam to reduce them to the knowledge of God, and to maintain them in it, in so much it affordeth a necessary instruction, to inform all that desire to be Christians, by what means the world was saved before and after the Law, and yet no salvation but by Christianity: which they that neglect, will sooner betray the cause of our common Christianity, than give a good account of so great a difficulty. The Socinians for certain will want footing against the Jews, either in shewing how the fathers were saved, or why they are rejected.

§ 7. It remaineth, that I give a reason, why the position of Socinus or of Pelagius, in denying the grace of Christ as the cure of original sin, is not consistent with the grounds of Christianity: which is to say, that the account which they are able to give for the coming of our Lord Christ, is not sufficient nor reasonable, because they deny this grace. Socinus<sup>o</sup> liberally granteth the grace of God in sending Christ to publish His Gospel, and to assure all mankind, that He is ready to pardon the sins of all that receive it, and to give them eternal life, living here as Christians undertake to do; that, having provided that our Lord Christ should be born of a virgin by the Holy Ghost, of His free grace He hath ex-

<sup>m</sup> Above, c. xiii. § 3—6: &c.

<sup>n</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c.

xxxi. § 36. notes a—x; and above, c.

xvi. § 8. notes p, q.

<sup>o</sup> See above, cc. i. § 5, x. § 3, 4.

BOOK  
II.

altered Him to the power and honour of God under Himself, thereby both rewarding His undertaking and performing this ambassage above merit, and assuring us both of the truth of the Gospel and of the performance of it to them that live conformable to Christ's cross, who have a Man of our own kind, endowed with God's own power, to deliver us from all enemies, of our own free will believing His Gospel so tendered, and living as it requireth. But, in all this, neither he nor Pelagius (who, as I said in the beginning<sup>p</sup>, as freely acknowledgeth that grace of God which consisteth in giving the Gospel, besides that free will which we come into the world with) tenders us any account at all, how it comes to pass, that all mankind is become enemy to God, and subject to His wrath : which until it be supposed to be true, there is no cause, why the Apostles and the Church after them should invite the world to undertake so much hardship as Christianity importeth ; and, therefore, St. Paul hath had care to set it forth as the ground of Christianity, in the beginning of his Epistle to the Romans.

[Rom. i.  
18—iii.  
20.]

[The imitation of Adam no sufficient account of the sinfulness of the world.]

§ 8. For it will not serve the turn to have recourse to the examples of their predecessors, and the nature of man apt to imitate them, as a sufficient reason hereof ; seeing this reason can go no higher than Adam, and that there is evidence, that through the grace of God good examples of his posterity, such as walked with God (if not of himself, as the Book of Wisdom affirms<sup>q</sup>, x. 1, and we have no cause to doubt), were performed before the eyes of them, who notwithstanding imitated the apostasy which he disclaimed. How then shall we imagine, supposing a good and an evil branch in his posterity, that the bad example should so be followed, that all the world should run after strange gods ; only a few fathers, by that intercourse which God granted them of grace, and the doctrine which came from their fathers (but to their fathers by grace), being preserved entire to God ? How comes the same to pass after the flood, in the posterity of so just a man as Noah, after such a horrible warning as the deluge ? Had the light of reason been such in discerning the

<sup>p</sup> Above, c. x. § 2, 3.

<sup>q</sup> " She (Wisdom) preserved the first formed father of the world, that was

created alone, and brought him out his fall, and gave him power to rule things." Wisd. x. 1, 2.



difference between good and bad, as the law of nature, and by consequence the state of man's creation, requireth; had man's inclination been without any bias contrary to that, which the light of reason, such as it is, shews; how could this have been? How comes it to pass, that the excellence of man's nature, and the reason that he is endowed with, serves for a reproach to all mankind, that now follows it? that those, who see the difference of good and bad when they are alone without witness, when they are under public engagements, commit those oppressions upon men, whereof they have no example even from beasts? Doth not all the learning, all the experience, of the world thus far give testimony to Christianity? And shall we think fit to advantage ourselves upon this plea against those that are not Christians, and straight to deny the consequence of it to Christians? Especially, having the fall of Adam so evident a beginning of it, set forth by Moses, and the coming of Christ by St. Paul for the cure of it. CHAP. XIX.  
[Rom. v. 15—19.]

§ 9. Thus far then we plead from the motives of our common faith. But when we come to measure the grace of Christ, which is the cure, by the Person of Christ, I suppose I have right to demand for true that which I have proved, that He is God and man, not by grace, nor by reward, but by birth: and [to] give notice to Pelagius, that Socinus, in a more cunning age of disputing, found it requisite for the maintenance of no necessity of grace, because no original sin, to deny Christ to be God incarnate; that so the grace of God, which the covenant of grace pretendeth, may consist in God's sending it, not in Christ's purchasing those helps whereby it is received and observed. Which had Pelagius seen how consequent it is to his saying, he, who held the true faith of the Holy Trinity, would probably never have proceeded to deny the grace of Christ. For would they have the Son of God born into the world and suffer death upon the cross, on purpose to testify the Gospel to be God's message? As if the Law had not been received before without it; being recommended by such miraculous works of God, that the Jews think\* there cannot be the like motives to

BOOK believe that it is abrogated by Christianity. Be their belief  
II. false, sure we are, God's arm was not shortened, to have no means in store to verify His Gospel but the death of His Son, that He might rise again to witness it. For that it should be done to assure them, who are persuaded that the Gospel is God's message, of the performance thereof on God's part<sup>t</sup>, is rather a blasphemy than a reason; inasmuch as he, who doubts whether God will perform, what he doubts not that He hath tied Himself to by covenant, believes not God to be God. And that we should be better assured of Christ's protection, because God hath freely bestowed upon Him the honour and power of God, than because He brought It in time into our flesh, Which He had from everlasting<sup>t</sup>; is a reason which no man can comprehend to be reasonable. For whatsoever grace comes to us by Christ, the more originally and inseparably that it belongs to Him, the better it is assured upon us.

[Grace  
needful for  
the under-  
taking,  
quite as  
much as  
for the per-  
formance,  
of the office  
of a Christ-  
ian.]

§ 10. But one thing I demand of Pelagius as well as of Socinus. For as Socinus expressly grants the habitual grace of the Holy Ghost to true Christians, as necessary to enable them in performing what they undertake by their Christianity<sup>u</sup>; so I suppose Pelagius<sup>x</sup>, had the question been put to him, would not have refused it. I demand then, whether a man in reason be more able to do the office of a Christian, having undertaken it, or to undertake it (to wit, sincerely), while he is free from the engagement of it; that is, whether a man's will be able inwardly to resolve, without any help of God's Spirit, to do that, which without the help of God's Spirit he cannot perform. I suppose, the inward act, according to all divines and philosophers, amounts to one and the same in esteem with the outward; and the beginning most difficult of all, when the proposition of Christianity is most strange. For a resolution upon mature debate of reason, as in such a case, and an engagement upon profession thereof, is a means powerful enough to carry a man to undergo as much hardship as Christianity requires, in a thing neither profitable nor pleasant. If, therefore, to the performance of Christianity the assistance of God's Spirit is requisite then,

<sup>t</sup> See above, c. i. § 5. note m.

<sup>u</sup> See above, c. x. § 7

<sup>x</sup> See above, c. x. § 3. notes f—h.



because our nature is averse then, much more to resolve us to it. Whereby it appears, that the same gift of the Holy Ghost, which (being purchased by the obedience of Christ) enabled the Apostles to do those things, and say those words, by which the world stands convict of the necessity of Christianity; the same it is, that effects the conviction of those who embrace it, and dwelling with them, enables them to live in it: according to the promise of God to His ancient people, Esay lix. 21; "And as for Me, this is My covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit which is upon thee, and My words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor thy seed's mouth, nor thy seed's seed's mouth, from this time for evermore."

§ 11. With the like brevity will I plead the tradition of the Church concerning the grace of Christ, evidencing the same by three particulars. The first whereof shall be of the baptism of infants: which as there can be no reason for, unless we believe original sin; so I do challenge, that it could not have come to be a law to the Church, had not the faith of the Church from the Apostles' time supposed original sin. First, negatively, from the proceeding of Pelagius. He first a monk in Britain, and travelling thence along to Rome, afterwards, either by himself or by his agent Cœlestius, to Constantinople, and Carthage, through Asia the less, and Africk, the East, Egypt, and Palestine, and not finding in all this vast compass any Church, in which it had not been accustomed to baptize infants; shall any man be now so mad as to imagine, that this can be discovered to have been taken up upon misprision or abuse, the custom of the Church having been otherwise afore? It is time, that the minds of men, that are possessed of their senses, should be employed

CHAP.  
XIX.

The tradition of the Church: 1. in the baptism of infants.

y "Pelagius natione . . Britannus, ex ceteriore Britannia quam . . Walliam dicimus. . . Monachum fuisse facile concedimus; collegii vero Bannocho-rensis fuisse Abbatem," &c., "nuda videntur Radulphi Cestrensis . . aliorumque somnia. Exeunte sæculo quarto, saltem ineunte quinto, Romam (ut videtur) se contulit. . . Anno 408 vel sequenti . . cum Cœlestio discipulo in Siciliam se recepit: ubi biennio vel —moratus, anno 411 in Afri-æ Hipponem appulit.

Anno sequenti in collatione Catholicos inter ac Donatistas Carthagine habita illum præsentem se vidisse testatur Augustinus. Exinde citatim properans, Ægyptum profectus est, monasteria ibi sita invisurus. Ex Ægypto Palæstinam petiit." After various fortunes there being finally condemned by both East and West, "quid illi exinde factum sit; ubi loci degerit; quando, vel quo mortis genere extinctus sit, minime constat." Cave, Hist. Lit. sub. tit. Pelagius Hæreticus.

BOOK  
II.

about things within the compass of reason; and not to persuade themselves, that they see what cannot be, because they cannot answer all arguments, that may be made against that which is, and is to be seen. Could Pelagius have found any footing to deny it, he was not such an idiot, as to suffer himself at every turn to be choked by the Catholics, objecting<sup>145</sup> the baptism of infants every where received in the Church; who might easily have put them to silence, by saying it was not an original Catholic practice of the whole Church, but the mistake of some men, which had prevailed by faction in some times and parts of the Church<sup>z</sup>: as I pretend, hereby, to maintain the Reformation against the present Church of Rome. Since [neither] that ingenious and learned heretic, nor any of his complices, hath been found to use this plea; all men, that intend not to renounce their common sense, will justify me, if I challenge positively St. Austin's rule in a particular of such moment as this is: that seeing it is manifest, that it was a law to the whole Church, that infants should be baptized; and that there can be assigned no original of it from any express act of the Church in council or otherwise; it is thereby evident, that it comes from the order of the Apostles<sup>a</sup>. The reason is, the unity of the Church; the principle upon which all this proceeds: whereby it appears, that it is utterly impossible, that a point of such importance to Christianity could have been admitted over all the world where Christians were, without any opposition or faction to overcome the same, had it not from the beginning been acknowledged to proceed from the common principle from which all ecclesiastical law is derived; to wit, from the authority of our Lord's Apostles, the founders of the Church.

[The Apostles' order respecting infant baptism.]

§ 12. It is not my intent hereby to say, that the Apostles' order was, that all should be baptized infants, whose parents were Christians afore; against which I find reasons alleged

<sup>z</sup> "Baptisma unum tenemus, quod iisdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in majoribus dicimus esse celebrandum." Pelag., ap. S. Aug., De Gratia Christi, c. xxxii. § 35; Op., tom. x. p. 245. D, E; and elsewhere.—"Quis ille tam impius est, qui cujuslibet ætatis parvulo interdicat communem humani generis redemptionem?" Id., ap. S. Aug., De Peccato Origin., c.

xix. § 21; Op., tom. x. p. 262. A.—See Wall, Inf. Bapt., Pt. i. c. xix. § 29—31; vol. i. pp. 430—452.

<sup>a</sup> "Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur." S. Aug., De Bapt. cont. Don iv. c. 24. § 31; Op., tom. C, D.



in Tertullian's book *De Baptismo*<sup>b</sup>, which I cannot deny to be considerable. But that no infant should go out of the world unbaptized,—that is it, which the great solicitude of Christians that no such thing should come to pass, the provision that a layman might baptize in case of necessity, which admitted not the solemnity of ministers of the Church<sup>c</sup>, the grief and astonishment which followed if at any time it came to pass<sup>d</sup>, will enable me, not only to affirm, but to infer both the reason of original sin, which the baptism of infants cureth, and the authority of the Apostles, which it proclaimeth.

§ 13. It may be said, that Pelagius himself allowed and maintained the baptism of infants, to bring them to the kingdom of heaven, not to everlasting life<sup>e</sup>. But this was but to make his own cause the more desperate. For had any intimation of the Scripture, any tradition or custom of the Church, justified any ground of difference between the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life, he might have escaped by pleading it. But being disowned in it, he hath left a desperate plea for those that come after him, to question the baptism of infants, and by consequence original sin; which if he, so many hundred years ago, could have found ground for, he need not have stood in the list of heretics.

§ 14. The visible ceremonies of baptism, which are so resolutely pleaded by his adversaries for evidence of the same<sup>f</sup>,

CHAP.  
XIX.

[Why Pelagius allowed the baptizing of infants.]

[The visible ceremonies of baptism.]

<sup>b</sup> See the passage above, c. iv. § 6. note y.

<sup>c</sup> "I find the greatest men of our own holy Church concur in opinion, that the primitive Church did allow lay-baptisms to be valid; viz., Dr. Cave, Bishop Sparrow, Mr. Thorndike, Mr. Hooker, Archbishop Whitgift, and others." Rev. E. Kelsall, Answ. to Dr. Waterland's First Letter, Sect. iii. § 31; in Waterland's Works, vol. x. p. 62.—See Bingham, Schol. Hist. of Lay Baptism, Pt. i. c. i. § 7, 8; Works, vol. viii. pp. 32—34; and Maskell, On Holy Baptism, c. viii. pp. 189—205.

<sup>d</sup> See Wall, Infant Baptism, Pt. ii. c. vi. § 4, sq. vol. ii. pp. 197 sq.

<sup>e</sup> "Non dicimus eos (parvulos) aliter salutem et vitam æternam non habituros nisi baptizentur in Christo: illi (parvuli) dicunt non propter baptismum vitam æternam, sed propter meritum." S.

Aug., Serm. ccxciv. § 2; Op., tom. v. p. 1183, D, &c.—And see Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. ii. P. ii. Thes. 4; Op., tom. vi. pp. 615, 616; and Wall, Inf. Bapt., Pt. i. c. xix. § 7; vol. i. pp. 360, 361.

<sup>f</sup> "Si Deum colis, in Quo speravit et sperat Ecclesia primitivorum, quæ conscripta est in cœlis, cur non credis baptizandos parvulos erui de potestate tenebrarum, cum eos propter hoc exsufflet atque exorcizet Ecclesia, ut ab eis potestas tenebrarum mittatur foras?" S. Aug., Opus Imperf. cont. Julian., lib. i. c. 50; Op., tom. x. p. 894. F. And elsewhere repeatedly. See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. ii. P. i. Thes. 5. (Op., tom. vi. pp. 603. b—604. b); of which the title states, that "aliud quoque eorum (Catholicorum) argumentum petebatur ab Ecclesiæ consuetudine . . . Christianæ, quæ baptismum et exorcismum parvulorum usurparet."

BOOK  
II.

are effectual to the same purpose. For if it was thought requisite, on behalf of infants, to renounce Satan and all his pomp and angels and instruments of this world, adhering to God; if it were solemn, by huffing and exorcizing, to use the power which God hath given His Church over unclean spirits, for the chasing of them out of infants that were baptized; certainly, those that did it, were so far from thinking, that man, as he is born, can be capable of that good Spirit which baptism promiseth, that they thought him to be liable to the contrary.

[Catechizing.]

§ 15. To this argument I will add the matter of that catechizing, [with] which the ancient Church prepared those for baptism who pretended to it; as I begun to shew you in the first Book<sup>e</sup>: for it is in a great part repeated in divers of these ancient forms of celebrating the eucharist, which are yet extant under the names of the Liturgies of Apostles and fathers, which I have named in my book of the public service of God<sup>h</sup>. The ancientest of them is that which is recorded in the Constitutions of the Apostles, viii. 11<sup>i</sup>. But you find also there, vii. 39<sup>j</sup>, the order of catechizing those that are to be baptized: providing, that they be instructed in the mercy of God, That suffered not mankind, being turned from Him, to perish, but in all ages provided means to recal them from sin and error to truth and righteousness; by the fathers first, and by the Law and prophets afterwards, until, all this proving ineffectual, He spared not at length to send His Son. And the same is the argument of that thanksgiving, which is premised to the consecration of the eucharist in the

<sup>e</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 11—15. And see above, c. iv. § 3.

<sup>h</sup> c. x. § 22—27, 42.

<sup>i</sup> Ap. Coteler., PP. Apost., tom. i. pp. 401, 402. See The Service of God at Relig. Assembl., c. x. § 26, 27.

<sup>j</sup> “Μανθανέτω δημιουργίας διαφόρου τάξιν, προνοίας εἰρμὸν, νομοθεσίας διαφόρου δικαιοσύνην. Παιδεύεσθω διὰ τὸν κόσμον γέγονε . . . παιδεύεσθω ὥπως ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκόλασεν ὕδατι καὶ πυρὶ, τοὺς δ' ἁγίους ἐδόξασε καθ' ἑκάστην γενεάν· λέγω δὴ τὸν Σὴθ, τὸν Ἐνῶς, τὸν Ἐνῶχ, τὸν Νῶε, τὸν Ἀβραάμ καὶ τοὺς ἐκγόνοὺς αὐτοῦ, τὸν Μελχισεδέκ, καὶ τὸν Ἰωβ, καὶ τὸν Μωσέα, Ἰησοῦν τε, καὶ Χαλεβ, καὶ Φινεὺς τὸν ἱερέα, καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην γενεάν ὁσίους. Ὅπως τε

προνοούμενος οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ Θεὸς τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ πλάνης καὶ ματαιότητος εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐκάλει κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς, ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας καὶ ἀσεβείας εἰς ἐλευθερίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν ἐπανάγων, ἀπὸ ἀδικίας εἰς δικαιοσύνην, ἀπὸ θανάτου αἰωνίου εἰς ζωὴν αἰδίου. Ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοῦτοις ἀκούοντα μανθανέτω ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει ὁ προσιών. Προσκυνεῖτω δὲ ὁ χειροθετῶν αὐτὸν τὸν Θεὸν τὸν τῶν ὅλων δεσπότην, εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλάσματος· ὅτι κατέπεμψε τὸν Ἰῶν Ἀυτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ Χριστὸν, ἵνα σώσῃ τὸν ἄνθρωπον,” κ.τ.λ. Constit. Apost., lib. iii. c. 39; ap. Coteler., PP. Apost., tom. i. p. 382.— See Bk. iii. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxiii. § 1, sq.



place quoted<sup>k</sup>; as also in the same work afore, ii. 55<sup>l</sup>, and in the liturgies to which I refer you<sup>m</sup>: an evidence, in my opinion, very considerable, to shew this point to belong to the substance of Christianity, as the subject matter both of that instruction which is requisite to make a man a Christian, and of both sacraments wherein the exercise thereof consisteth.

CHAP.  
XIX.

§ 16. In the second place, I allege such an evidence for the grace of Christ, as no point of Christianity can produce better, from the practice of the Church. For I allege the prayers of the Church, all over, and from the beginning; that they have always contained three things: the first is, of thanksgivings for our Christianity; that is, for the coming of Christ, the preaching of His Gospel, and the effect thereof in converting us to be Christians: the second, of prayers, that we may be able to persevere in that to which we are so converted, and to perform what we undertake by professing ourselves Christians, notwithstanding the temptations of our ghostly enemies to depart from it: the third and last, in that these thanks and prayers are tendered to God in Christ, for His sake, signifying the acknowledgment of His grace in bringing us to be Christians, and the expectation of those helps by which we must persevere, from the consideration of His merits and suffering<sup>n</sup>. For as for prayers and thanksgivings in general, it cannot be said, that the offering of them can argue either the decay of our nature or the repairing of the same by Christ: because those that acknowledge not Christ (Jews and Mahometans), must and do use them, if they pretend religion and the service of God; yea, even pagans, according to their sense. But to pray and give thanks to God to make men, or because He hath made men, Christians; or for the helps of salvation, which by being Christians, that is, by Christ, we attain to, as by Him we attain to be Christians; must needs appear utterly ground-

2. In the  
prayers  
of the  
Church.

<sup>k</sup> Constit. Apost., lib. viii. c. 12; *ibid.*, pp. 403—407.

<sup>l</sup> "Ο γὰρ Θεὸς, Θεὸς ὦν ἐλέους, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐκάστην γενεάν ἐπὶ μετάνοιαν καλεῖ διὰ τῶν δικαίων καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Καὶ τοὺς μὲν πρὸ τοῦ κατακλύσ-  
"Αβελ καὶ Σὴμ καὶ Σὴθ, ἔτι  
ὕ μεταθέντος Ἐνώχ ἐσω-

φρόνιζε," κ.τ.λ. Constit. Apost., lib. ii. c. 55; *ibid.*, p. 262.

<sup>m</sup> Service of God at Relig. Assembl., c. x. § 39—42.

<sup>n</sup> See *ibid.*, § 41, 42; below, Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxiii. § 1 sq.; and Palmer, Orig. Liturg., c. iv. § x. vol. ii. pp. 88 sq.

BOOK  
II.

3. In the decrees against Pelagius, and other records of the Church.

less, unless we suppose, that there was no other way left for our salvation : which cannot be understood by any means, but by the fall of Adam and the consequences thereof, to come to pass.

§ 17. In the last place, I allege the decrees of the whole Church against Pelagius, together with the consent of those parts of the Church which otherwise cannot be understood to be concluded by those decrees. For it is manifest, there was no decree of the whole Church against Pelagius, as against Arius; the councils of Carthage<sup>o</sup>, and of Numidia<sup>p</sup>, that of Palestine<sup>q</sup>, and in after times that of Orange<sup>r</sup>, being but particular councils, not containing the consent of the whole. But this consideration, in another regard, turns to the advantage of the Church's cause. For when those parts of the Church which are not obliged by the decrees, do voluntarily and freely join in giving effect to them (as it is manifest they did at that time, by the concurrence of the bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the great council of Ephesus, in Vossius, *Hist. Pel.* i. 38, 39, 47<sup>t</sup>, and do since by owning the acts done against them), there can be no pretence of faction, to sway them to go along with those whom they are loth to offend : but all must be imputed to the sense of that Christianity, which hitherto they found themselves persuaded of, and therefore agreed not to admit to their communion those who acknowledged it not; which is the effect of all such decrees of the Church. In the mean time, I forget not the records of the Church in writing; that is, the testimonies of those writers, who, going before Pelagius, and giving testimony against him, cannot be thought to join in faction to oppress any truth which he preached<sup>t</sup>. And upon

<sup>o</sup> Concil. Carthagin. XII. XIII. and XIV. A.D. 412, 416, 418. Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, vol. i. See Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. i. cc. xl. xlii. xlv.; Op., tom. vi. pp. 585, 586. b, 587.

<sup>p</sup> Concil. Milevitanum II., held in Numidia A.D. 416. Cave, *ibid.* See Voss., *ibid.*, c. xliii. p. 586. a.

<sup>q</sup> Concil. Hierosol. A.D. 415; and Diospolitanum A.D. 415. Cave, *ibid.* See Voss., *ibid.*, c. xli. p. 585. b.

<sup>r</sup> Concil. Arausican. II., A.D. 529; held at Orange near Avignon. Cave, *ibid.* See Voss., *ibid.*, c. liii. pp. 592, 593.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. i. c. xxxviii.; Op., tom. vi. pp. 584. b, 585. a. "De Attico et Sisinnio Episcopis Constantinopolitanis" (the former, Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of Pelagius, the latter, his immediate successor in that see): c. xxxix.; p. 585. a. "De Theophilo, Cyrillo, et Joanne, Episcopis Alexandrinis:" c. xlvii.; pp. 588. b, 589. c. "De Concilio Ephesino generali" (A.D. 431): proving that both bishops and council condemned Pelagius' heresy.

<sup>t</sup> The quotations are given at length in Vossius as quoted in note x, below.



this evidence, I challenge, both the belief of original sin to be necessary to the acknowledgment of the grace of Christ, which Christianity professeth; and, also, that the grace of Christ is that which enables us to begin, continue, and finish the good work of our Christianity (and therefore to every part 147 of it); and, by consequence, that this grace is not given us in consideration of any thing, that we are able to do towards the obliging of God to bestow it upon us.

§ 18. But I will not take upon me to inflame this abridg-ment with rehearsal of the testimonies of Church writers that went afore Pelagius, in both these points. The testimonies of fathers that went afore him, which St. Augustin hath produced<sup>a</sup>, are enough to put those to silence, which would have original sin to be a device of his. But Vossius in his History of the Pelagians having comprised as well these as the rest concerning original sin, Libro ii. Parte i. Thes. 6<sup>x</sup>, and those which concern the necessity of grace, Libro iii. Parte 1. Thes. 1. and 2<sup>y</sup>, it will not be to the purpose to do any part of that which hath been sufficiently done already, over again.

§ 19. To me indeed it seems very considerable, that Pelagius,—acknowledging for grace, first, free will, and the law which teacheth the difference between good and bad, after that, for the grace of Christ, His doctrine and example first,

CHAP.  
XIX.

[Testimonies of Church writers in Vossius.]

[Pelagius acknowledged enough for grace to make him inconsistent in denying more.]

<sup>a</sup> "Quemadmodum adstrictum est, inquit, morti genus humanum per virginem, solvatur per virginem . . . Adhuc enim protoplasti peccato per correctionem primogeniti emendationem accipiente, serpentis prudentia devicta per simplicitatem columbæ; vinculis illis resoluti sumus, per quæ alligati eramus morti." Iren. (Adv. Hæc., lib. v. c. 19. p. 429. b), as quoted by S. Augustin, Cont. Julianum, lib. i. c. iii. § 5; Op., tom. x. p. 500. B.—"Ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐμπεδύσαμεν, ἐξενέσωμεν τοῦ παπαδελσού." S. Basil., De Jejunio, Homil. i. c. 4; Op., tom. ii. p. 3. C: quoted by S. Aug., Cont. Julianum, lib. i. c. v. § 18; ibid., p. 507. C.—"Infans . . . recens natus, nihil peccavit, nisi quod, secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativæ contraxit." S. Cyprian., Ep. lxiiv. Fidum, p. 161: quoted by S. A. Cont. Julianum, lib. i. c. lii. § 6: p. 500. D; and Ad Be

Duas Pelagian. Epist., lib. iv. c. viii. § 23; ibid., p. 482. C, D.—See these and numerous other passages both of the same and of other fathers, cited by St. Augustin, in Vossius as quoted in the next note.

<sup>a</sup> Op., tom. vi. pp. 604—612. The title of the Thesis is, "Denique probat hoc dogma" (of original sin) "Augustinus e scriptis priorum Patrum: quorum luculenta adeo testimonia depromit (nec minus illustria sunt multa quæ præterit), ut plane sit mirandum," &c.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid., pp. 644—649.—"Necessitatem gratiæ clare agnoverunt Patres Latini qui Pelagii tempora antecesserunt," &c. Tit. of Thes. i.—"Qui vero negant Græcos Patres hanc de gratiæ doctrinam intellexisse, gravem faciunt: cum ut passim." Tit.

BOOK  
II.

then the illumination of the mind by the Holy Ghost,—yet always maintained, that man without the help of grace is able to love God above all, to keep His commandments, and resist the greatest temptations to the contrary: and in all these points was condemned by the Church, as you may see there, Libro iii. Parte ii. Thes. 1—8.<sup>2</sup> For, certainly, there is a vast difference between the doctrine of God's laws (absolutely necessary to the doing of His will, even for Adam in the state of innocency), and the preaching of the Gospel, convincing mankind that they are under God's wrath by sin, tendering pardon to them that embrace it, assuring of everlasting life or death according as they observe the profession of it, and shewing the way by our Lord's example: all which the Scriptures ascribe to the coming of Christ, as granted in consideration of it. How much more, when he granteth the illumination of the Holy Ghost to shew what is to be done<sup>a</sup>, must he needs transgress his own position; which saith, that there is no difference between that state in which we are born, and that in which Adam was made (saving his example), but the difference between a man and a babe<sup>b</sup>? For were we born as Adam was made, what needed Christ to have purchased by His death the gift of the Holy Ghost, to enlighten us inwardly in doing that, which without it man is born able to do? And, having granted the reasons and motives, upon which Christians act as Christians, to be shewed them both outwardly and inwardly by the grace of Christ, to deny the necessity of the said grace to the acts which proceed from the same, can have no excuse, but one,—that Christ came only to evidence the truth of His message, leaving the embracing or rejecting of it to every man's choice. Which to maintain, if Socinus was fain to make our Lord Christ a

<sup>a</sup> Op., tom. vi. pp. 650—660. Which Part of the work "collationem instituit inter Pelagianam et Catholicam doctrinam de gratiæ necessitate."

<sup>a</sup> See above, c. x. § 2.

<sup>b</sup> "Quid ad rem de qua nunc agitur pertinet, . . . quia dicit" (Pelagius), "ideo infantes non in eo statu esse, in quo fuit Adam ante prævaricationem, quia isti præceptum capere nondum possunt, ille autem potuit; nondumque utuntur rationalis voluntatis arbitrio,

quo ille nisi uteretur, non ei præceptum daretur?" Quid hoc ad rem pertinet, quia verba sibi objecta sic exponendo, recte se putat damnassee quod dicitur, . . . infantes qui nascuntur, in eo statu esse, in quo Adam fuit ante peccatum?" S. Aug., De Pecc. Orig., c. xv. § 16; Op., tom. x. pp. 259. G, 260. A, B. See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. iii. P. ii. Thes. 10; Op., tom. vi. p. 666. b.



mere man, that there might be no more in His rising after death than a miracle to assure it; Pelagius, acknowledging the Trinity, will be straightened by St. Paul's consequence,—  
 “If righteousness come by the Law, then is Christ dead in vain:” supposing the death of Christ to bring that help of grace, which a miracle by evidencing the truth of the Gospel doth not. And, seeing God could not be moved by any thing that man could do to give our Lord Christ and the helps which His coming bringeth with it, there will be no more left for Pelagius to say; but that these helps are not granted of grace, but received by the works which men prevent it with. The foundation therefore of the Christian faith consisting in God's sending our Lord Christ of His pure free grace, by virtue whereof all the effects of it are works of the same grace; necessary it was, that Pelagius should be condemned for the denying of the necessity of grace to all acts of Christianity, and for affirming that grace is given according to man's merits: as you see there, *Thesi 9<sup>c</sup> and 11<sup>d</sup>*, that he was: both, upon the doctrine of St. Paul premised afore<sup>e</sup>, that God was not moved by the works either of Jews or Gentiles to send them those helps to salvation which the Gospel tendereth.

CHAP.  
XIX.[Gal. ii.  
28.][Rom. i.  
18—iii.  
20.]

§ 20. Nevertheless, the preaching of the Gospel, and all the help which it bringeth toward the embracing of it, is no less the grace of Christ, because Pelagius was forced for the better colouring of his heresy to acknowledge it. Only, it is not therefore to be said, that it is all the help which the  
 148 grace of God by Christ furnisheth toward that salvation which Christianity tendereth; but to be left to further dispute, what further help is granted by God, before and without any consideration of man's merit, to bring to effect those acts in which the discharge of our Christianity consisteth:

<sup>c</sup> “De Pelagianis . . satis ex iis, quæ diximus, constare potest, nequiquam eos ad singulos actus bonos requisivisse auxilium Dei: quod tum de naturalibus ac civilibus, tum etiam de supernaturalibus actionibus intelligi debet.” Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. iii. P. ii. *Thes.* 9. tit.; *ibid.*, p. 662. a.

<sup>d</sup> Voss., *ibid.*, p. 669: quoting e. g. the words attributed to Julian by S. Aug. (*Cont. Duas Epist. Pelagian.*, lib. i. c.

xix. § 37; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 427. C, D), “Aisti in bono opere a Dei gratia semper adjuvari, tanquam sua voluntate, nulla Dei gratia, bonum opus aggressus, in ipso jam opere divinitus adjuvetur; pro meritis videlicet voluntatis bonæ, ut reddatur debita gratia, non donetur indebita; ac sic gratia jam non sit gratia.”

cc. viii. § 15, ix. § 10, xviii. § 3.

BOOK  
II.

excluding therefore the pretence of Pelagius<sup>f</sup>, that before Moses the godly fathers pleased God by the mere strength of nature, and that salvation was to be had under the Law by the same; besides the good works of the Gentiles, where-with God was pleased, according to Pelagius<sup>g</sup>: whom the Church condemned in this article also, as you may see there, Thes. 10<sup>h</sup>.

[How Pelagius and Socinus must reason concerning the salvation of the fathers through Christ.]

§ 21. And truly Pelagius, acknowledging the Gospel to be no more than the declaration of that will of God by which man is to be saved after Christ, as the Law before Christ, utterly overthroweth the plea of the Church derived from the Apostles, that the fathers were saved by faith before and under the Law: that the New Testament was in force under the Old, by virtue of that commerce, which God by His Word (Which afterwards being incarnate was our Lord Christ) held with the fathers; His Spirit, as naturally planted in the Word, going along to procure the efficacy of it<sup>i</sup>. Whereas Socinus, though he acknowledgeth the difference between the literal and mystical sense of the Law<sup>k</sup>, yet, making our Lord Christ a mere man, the virtue of Whose death could not extend to the salvation of those who lived afore His coming, destroyeth the ground of that which he acknowledgeth; this supposition, that Christianity is more ancient than Judaism, being necessary to the maintaining of the Church against the synagogue. Which is verified by God's

<sup>f</sup> "Dicimus, inquit" (scil. Julianus), "sanctos Veteris Testamenti perfecta hinc iustitia ad æternam transisse vitam, id est, studio virtutis ab omnibus recessisse peccatis; quia et illi quos legimus aliquid peccasse, postea tamen eos emendasse cognovimus. . . Distribuitis tempora secundum Pelagium; in cuius libris hoc legitur: et ante Legem dicitis salvos factos esse per naturam, deinde per Legem, postremo per Christum." S. Aug., Cont. Duas Epist. Pelag., lib. i. c. xxi. § 39; Op., tom. x. p. 429. A, C.

<sup>g</sup> "Soletis, . . negantes Dei dona esse virtutes quibus recte vivitur, et eas naturæ voluntatiq; humanæ, non gratiæ Dei tribuentes, hoc uti argumento, quod eas nonnunquam habeant infideles." S. Aug., Cont. Julian., lib. iv. c. iii. § 14; Op., tom. x. p. 590. F, G.—  
"Exempla nobis opponitis impiorum,

quos dicitis alienos a fide abundare virtutibus, in quibus sine adjutorio gratiæ, solum est naturæ bonum, licet superstitionibus mancipatum, qui solis libertatis ingenitæ viribus, et misericordes crebro, et modesti, et casti inveniuntur, et sobrii." Id., ibid., § 16; ibid., p. 592. B.—  
"Probare conatus es, etiam alienos a fide Christi veram posse habere iustitiam, eo quod isti, teste Apostolo, naturaliter quæ legis sunt faciunt. Ubi quidem dogma vestrum quo estis inimici gratiæ Dei, . . . evidentiis expressisti: introducens hominum genus, quod Deo placere possit sine Christi fide, lege naturæ." Id., ibid., § 23; ibid., p. 597. A, B.

<sup>h</sup> Voss, Hist. Pelag., lib. iii. P. ii. Thes. 10; Op., tom. vi. pp. 665. a—667. a.

<sup>i</sup> See above, c. viii. § 2, 14—17.

<sup>k</sup> See above, c. v. § 10. note h.



designing of a Church for the spouse of His Son, before the fall, figured by the marriage between Adam and Eve, according to St. Paul, Ephes. v. 22—33. But presently after the fall, that Word, Which being incarnate is<sup>1</sup> our Lord Christ, having declared “enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent,” saying, “It shall break thy head, and thou shalt bruise the heel of it;” the first Adam became “the figure” of the second, according to the same St. Paul, Rom. v. 14. Whereupon the Spirit of the second Adam, in those “preachers of righteousness” to whom the Word of God came, in that angel whom the fathers worshipped for God<sup>m</sup>, strove from thenceforth to recover man from the labour of sin (to which, when he became mortal, he was condemned) to paradise, from whence he had been expelled. And therefore our Lord Christ, according to St. Peter (1 Pet. iv. 18—20), “going” out of the world, by that Spirit whereby He was “made alive” when He had been “put to death in the flesh,” to wit, speaking in His Apostles, “preached to the spirits in prison, that had been disobedient in the days of Noe;” converting the Gentiles by the gift of His Spirit granted upon His sufferings, who had refused the same in Noe the “preacher of righteousness” (2 Pet. ii. 5), when God said, “My Spirit shall no more strive with man,” Gen. vi. 3. For the pilgrimage of the patriarchs, the promise of the land of Canaan, the law given by Moses, was all but the further limitation and rule of that outward and civil conversation, under which the traffic of Christianity was then driven by prophets, who spake by God’s Spirit. This reason Socinus being obliged to misken, by making our Lord Christ a mere man, cannot give that account of the grace of Christ before His coming, which the Church doth: acquitting thereby my position, that the Law covenanteth expressly only for the land of promise<sup>n</sup>, of all suspicion of compliance with his intentions.

§ 22. By this you see, that Pelagius and Socinus both are carried out of the way of Christianity, because they will not acknowledge the decay of mankind by the fall of Adam, and

CHAP.  
XIX.

[Gen. iii.  
15.]

[2 Pet. ii.  
5.]

[“not al-  
ways  
strive.”]

[The Mas-  
silians.]

<sup>1</sup> Misprinted “in,” in orig. text.

<sup>m</sup> See above, c. xiii. § 3—6.

<sup>n</sup> Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc.

xii. § 5, sq., xiii. § 1, sq.: and above, cc. viii. § 9, 13; ix. § 10; x. § 8.

BOOK  
II.

the coming of Christ to repair it. But those of Marseilles and the parts adjoining in France, that formalized themselves against St. Augustin's doctrine of predestination and effectual grace, freely and heartily acknowledging original sin<sup>o</sup>; seem to have insisted<sup>p</sup> only upon the true interest of Christianity in that free will, which the covenant of grace necessarily supposeth: though, mistaking their way out of human frailty, they failed of the truth, though they parted with Pelagius. They made faith, or at least the beginning of faith, and of will to believe, to repent, and to turn unto God, the work of free will; in consideration whereof God, though<sup>149</sup> no way tied so to do, grants the help of His grace and Spirit, to perform the race of faith: most truly maintaining (according to that which hath been professed in the beginning of this Book<sup>q</sup>), that the act of true faith is an act of man's free will, which God rewardeth with His free grace, to wit, with the habitual gift of His Spirit, enabling true believers to go through with that faith, which thereby they undertake; as I have shewed you both these elsewhere<sup>r</sup>: most expressly acknowledging the preaching of the Gospel going before, in which, whatsoever help the coming of our Lord Christ hath furnished to move and win the world to believe, is involved: but miskenning the grace of the Gospel granted by God in consideration of His obedience, to make Him a Church that might honour Him for it<sup>s</sup>. If Pelagius acknowledged no more in the coming of Christ than to make His message appear to be true, so that the embracing of it might oblige

<sup>o</sup> See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. iv. (Op., tom. vi. pp. 682—705), for the opinions of the Massilians upon the subjects of preventing grace and original sin; and lib. vi. (ibid., pp. 733—768), upon those of predestination and effectual grace.

<sup>p</sup> Corrected from MS. "justified," in orig. text.

<sup>q</sup> cc. iii. § 8; v. § 1—11.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid.

<sup>s</sup> "Massiliensium dogma partim respicit præparationem ad Spiritum sanctificantem; partim perseverantiam in bono. Ad prius quod attinet, fatebantur quidem gratiam prævenientem, sed eam duntaxat, quæ præveniat opera bona; in quo a Juliano distinguuntur: non item, quæ præveniat initium fidei et bonæ voluntatis, per quæ Deum ab

homine præveniri credebant. Nec tamen, ex eorum mente, semper homo prævenit Deum, sed interdum: quo et ipso differunt a Juliano. Tertium etiam inter hos discrimen erat. Nam Julianus profitebatur, hominem per conatus bonos gratiam promereri: Cassianus vero et Massilienses etiam ipsi eos damnabant, qui dicerent gratiam secundum merita conferri: idque eo quod judicarent non tanti esse primos naturæ conatus, ut dici posset per eos nos dignos reddi gratia Spiritus Sancti. Interea fatebantur, esse occasionem, qua moveatur Deus ut gratiam suam donet. Nempe tantam Dei esse misericordiam aiebant, ut tantillum boni orsum luculento adeo premio rependat." Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. iv. P. i. Thes. 1. tit.; Op., tom. vi. p. 683. a.



God to grant His grace by preventing it with an act of free will complying with it: the reason was not, because this very tender, being the purchase of our Lord Christ's free obedience, could be subject to any merit of man; but because he was engaged to maintain, that we are born in the same estate in which Adam was made, needing nothing but God's declaration of His will and pleasure towards the fulfilling of it. But for them, who acknowledge the decay of our nature by the fall of Adam, and the coming of our Lord to repair the breaches of it, to ascribe the grace, which God furnisheth those that believe with for the performing of that which by believing they undertake, to the act of free will in believing; which themselves acknowledge to be prevented by so many effects of Christ's coming as the preaching of His Gospel necessarily involveth, and which the Scriptures so openly acknowledge to be prevented by the grace of His Spirit purchased by His sufferings; must needs argue a great deal of difficulty in the question: which, the worse divines they appear, must needs justify them to be much the better Christians.

§ 23. And, indeed, there is great cause to excuse them, as far as reason will give leave, in a case wherein the fathers that went afore Pelagius seem to be engaged with them. For it is ordinary enough to read them exhorting to lay out the endeavours of free will, expecting the assistance of God's grace, to the accomplishment of that which a man purposes. And besides St. Augustin, who acknowledges, that before the contest with Pelagius he did think faith to be the act of free will, which God blesseth with grace to do as he professeth<sup>t</sup>; it cannot be denied, that St. Jerom<sup>u</sup>, so great an enemy to

CHAP.  
XIX.

[How far they are justified by the fathers before Pelagius.]

<sup>t</sup> "Quo præcipue testimonio etiam convictus sum, cum similiter errarem, putans fidem, qua in Deum credimus, non esse donum Dei, sed a nobis esse in nobis, et per illam nos impetrare Dei dona, quibus temperanter et juste et pie vivamus in hoc sæculo. Neque enim fidem putabam gratia præveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur, quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non præcederet præconium veritatis; ut autem prædicato nobis evangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse proprium, et nobis ex nobis esse

arbitrabar." S. Aug., De Prædest. Sanct., lib. i. c. 3. § 7; Op., tom. x. p. 793. E, F. See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. iv. P. ii. Thes. 1; Op., tom. vi. p. 700. a.

<sup>u</sup> "Quam acris enim Pelagii adversarius fuit Hieronymus? Et tamen nonne durius ab eo dictum fuit, quod legimus pene initio lib. iiii. contra Pelagianos. 'Seito,' inquit" (Op., tom. iv. P. ii. pp. 532, 533), "'baptismum præterita donare peccata. non futuram servare justitiam ac dili

BOOK II. the Pelagians, with some others\*, have expressed that which amounts to it. But it is true, on the other side, that the same fathers do frequently acknowledge the beginning as well as the accomplishment of our salvation to the grace of God†. Which is not only an obligation, so to expound their sayings, when they set free will before grace, as supposing the cure thereof begun by grace; but also a presumption, that those who express not the like caution, are no otherwise to be understood: especially, supposing expressly the motives of faith provided by the Holy Ghost, granted in consideration of our Lord's sufferings; in virtue whereof the resolution which is taken for the best, must of necessity proceed, though by the operation of the same Spirit, whereby they are advanced and furnished. It is therefore, no doubt, a commendable thing, to excuse the writings of that excellent person John Cassian‡, so far as the common faith will give leave; as you may see the learned Vossius§ doth: as

Dei clementia custoditur; ut nostrum sit rogare, Illius tribuere quod rogatur, nostrum incipere, Illius perficere; nostrum offerre quod possumus, Illius implere quod non possumus." Voss., *ibid.*, p. 701. a.

\* "Est ergo a nobis, cum oramus, exordium, ut munus ab Eo" (Deo) "sit." S. Hilar. Pictav., Tract. in Ps. cxviii. Litt. v. He, § 12; Op., p. 275. D.—"Licet a Deo intelligentia perfecta sit, tamen a nobis incipiendum est, ut possimus perfectam intelligentiam promereri. His enim qui non hoc per se inchoant, clausa a Deo omnia sunt." *Id.*, *ibid.*, Litt. xiii. Mem, § 12; *ibid.*, p. 330. A, B.—"Voluntas nostra hoc proprium ex se habere debet, ut velit: Deus incipienti incrementum dabit; quia consummationem per se infirmitas nostra non obtinet, meritum tamen adipiscendæ consummationis est ex initio voluntatis." *Id.*, *ibid.* Litt. xiv. Nun, § 20; *ibid.*, p. 329. A.—"Nostrum est velle, nostrum est currere, Dei perficere." Optat. Milev., De Schism. Donat., lib. ii. § 20. p. 44. ed. Dupin.—"Hæc apud se dixit: sed non satis est dicere, nisi ad Patrem venias... Exurge primo, hoc est, qui sedens antea dormiebas. Et ideo dicit Apostolus, 'Surge qui dormis, et exurge a mortuis.' Iniquitas in talento plumbeo sedet. Moysi dicitur, 'Tu autem hic sta.' Stantes elegit Christus. Exurge

ergo, curre ad ecclesiam." S. Ambros., *Expos. Evang. secund. Luc.*, lib. vii. § 229; Op., tom. i. p. 1466. A, B.—"Μόνον θέλησον, καὶ Αὐτὸς" (Θεὸς) "προσπαντῇ." S. Basil. M., De Pœnit., § 3; Op., tom. ii. p. 605. E.—See Voss., *ibid.*, p. 701. a, b.

† See Voss., *ibid.*, pp. 702, 703.

‡ Johannes Cassiani, Presbyteri Massiliensis, Collationes Patrum in Scythica Eremo commorantium (ed. Gazæus inter Op. Cassian. fol. Atrebat. 1628); accused of Pelagianism by S. Prosper, De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio liber contra Collatorem: about A.D. 424. See Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. i. c. vii; Op., tom. vi. pp. 562. b—564. a: Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, vol. i.

\* "Cum eo psee libro Cassianus gratiæ prævenientis necessitatem tum ponat, tum tollat (quod inconstantia ejus tribuit B. Prosper), Gennadio fortasse parum credibile videbatur, virum ingenio et eruditione pollentem in scripto elaboratissimo turpiter adeo secum pugnare: eoque credere maluit, cum gratiam prævenientem requirit, loqui de gratia simpliciter; cum eandem necessariam negat, intelligere gratiam prædeterminantem. Quod de Cassiano diximus, idem in Fausto locum habere potest." Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. i. c. x.; Op., tom. vi. p. 568. a. And also lib. iv. P. i. Anth. 1; *ibid.* 684. b, 685. a: and elsewhere.



speaking ambiguously, in setting grace before free will sometimes, as well as other whiles free will before grace. For Faustus his book *De Libero Arbitrio*<sup>b</sup>, I cannot say the same; though I must needs have that respect for his Christian qualities, which the commendations that I read of him in Sidonius Apollinaris<sup>c</sup> deserve. For, besides that the style of it is generally such, as seems to make free will the umpire between the motions of grace and of sin (which ascribes the ability of well-doing to God, but the act to ourselves<sup>d</sup>), that the fathers under the law of nature were saved by free will, he delivers<sup>e</sup> expressly with Pelagius: an oversight gross enough in any man, that shall have considered, upon what

150 terms Christianity is to be justified against the Jews out of the Old Testament. There is therefore appearance enough, that the second council of Orange, which finally decreed against the heresy of Pelagius, was held expressly to remove the offences which that book had made<sup>f</sup>: and evidence enough, that the articles of it are justified by the tradition of the whole Church. For those prayers of the Church, that way and subject of catechising which the Church tendered those who stood for baptism, the subject of that thanksgiving which the eucharist was consecrated with, do more effectually evidence the common sense of Christians in the matter of our common Christianity, than the sayings of divines; being

<sup>b</sup> Fausti Episc. Regiensis De Gratia Dei et Humanæ Mentis Libero Arbitrio libri duo (ap. Magn. Biblioth. PP., tom. v. P. iii. pp. 503. D—522. H.). He flourished about A.D. 472: and maintained semi-Pelagian doctrines both in this work and in his *Epistola ad Lucidum Presbyterum*. See Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. i. c. viii.; *Op.*, tom. vi. pp. 564. b—565. b: Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, vol. i.: Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.*, tom. xvi.

<sup>c</sup> Sidon. Apollin., *Carm.* xvi. *Euchar. ad Faustum*, and *Epist.* lib. ix. *Epist.* 3. Dom. Papæ Fausto; *Op.*, pp. 252—255, 381—385. ed. Sirmoud. Paris. 1652.

<sup>d</sup> See the passages collected in Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. iv. P. i. *Thes.* 2; *Op.*, tom. vi. pp. 687. b, 688. a.

<sup>e</sup> “Unde et in lib. ii. per naturalem vigorem absque gratiæ adjutorio multos, non solum ante adventum Domini, verum etiam ante legem literæ sal-

vatos, atque ad plenam cordis puritatem perfectamque justitiam pervenisse, filiosque Dei fieri meruisse, impudenter et procaciter asseverat.” Johan. Maxent., *Epist. ad Hormisd.*; ap. Magn. Biblioth. PP., tom. vi. P. i. p. 381. C: quoting from Faustus’ book above mentioned, lib. ii. c. 7; p. 519. D—H.—See Voss., as quoted in note d, p. 689. a.

<sup>f</sup> “Pervenit ad nos esse aliquos, qui de gratia et libero arbitrio per simplicitatem minus caute et non secundum fidei catholicæ regulam sentire velint.” *Præfat. ad Concil. Arausic.* II. *Capitul.*; ap. Labb., *Concil.*, tom. iv. p. 1664. E.—“Hic sacer conventus episcoporum habitus est occasione scriptorum quorundam Fausti Regensis, . . . de gratia Dei, qua salvamur, in quo” (*opere*) “sub specioso titulo Pelagium damnans, vere Pelagianizat.” Not. Sever. Bini in *Concil. Arausic.* II.; ap. Labb., *ibid.*, p. 1674. B.

BOOK  
II.

solicitous so to maintain the grace of God, that the free will of man (which the interest of our common Christianity equally obligeth us justly to maintain) may suffer no prejudice. How much more, when it is to be justified, that those sayings of divines (expounded by other sayings of their own, and principles evidently acknowledged by themselves) can create no other sense than the necessity of preventing grace, might the Church be able and obliged to proceed to those decrees. Though as for the persons (whom we do not find involved in any further censure than the mark set upon their writings by the see of Rome<sup>s</sup>); as there is cause to think, that respect was had to them, because their principles did not really engage them in any contradiction to the faith of the Church; so is there cause to think, that, being better informed in it by the treaty of that council, they surceased for the future all opposition to the decrees of it. For the evidence of that which hath been said, in the point of fact, I [Vossius.] remit the reader to my author so oft named; with these considerations, pointing out the consequence of each particular. His ingenuity, learning, and diligence, is such, that I have neither found myself obliged to quarrel at any thing that he hath delivered in point of historical truth, nor to seek for more than he hath laid forth.

§ 24. And by that which hath been said, we presume, not that the preaching of the Gospel is not the grace of Christ, which Pelagius acknowledged necessary to salvation, but that the determination of the will to embrace that grace, which the grace of the Gospel tendereth, is not effected by the will alone, without those helps of grace which are granted in consideration of Christ, though depending upon the preaching of the Gospel and the reasons and motives which it tendereth to embrace it. Here then, you see, I might have made a great book, to set forth those things which are commonly alleged by those that write of the great dispute between grace and free will now on foot, to shew what the Church insisted upon, and what reasons it did proceed upon against

<sup>s</sup> The works of both Faustus and Cassian are placed among the "apocryphal books, which are not received," by Pope Gelasius and the Roman council in 494 (Labbe, Concil., tom. iv. p.

1265. C); and Faustus is also condemned by Pope Hormisda, Epist. ad Possessorem, A.D. 520 (ibid., p. 1532. A).



Pelagius: but because there is no question made of all this by those that deny the consequences of it, it shall serve my turn to have pointed out the reasons of those consequences, and now to take notice of this great dispute; which is come in my way so cross, that it is not possible for me to void the difficulties, which I have undertaken concerning the covenant of grace, without voiding of it. For having first shewed, that the condition, which the covenant of grace requires on our part, consists in an act of man's free will, to embrace and persevere in Christianity till death<sup>h</sup>; and now, that man is not able to perform this condition without the help of God's grace by Christ<sup>i</sup>: the question is at the height, how the act of free will depends upon God's free grace, and a man becomes entitled to the promise for doing that, which without the help of God's grace he cannot do. And this the greater, because, if the help of grace determine the free will of them that embrace and persevere in Christianity so to do, then, it seems, the sin and damnation of those that do not so, is to be imputed to the want of those helps, and God's appointment of not giving them to those that have them not.

C H A P.  
XIX.

## CHAPTER XX.

WHEREIN ORIGINAL SIN CONSISTETH. WHAT OPINIONS ARE ON FOOT. THAT IT IS NOT ADAM'S SIN IMPUTED TO HIS POSTERITY. WHETHER MAN WERE AT THE FIRST CREATED TO A SUPERNATURAL END, OR NOT. AN ESTATE OF MERE NATURE, BUT INNOCENT, POSSIBLE. ORIGINAL SIN IS CONCU-PISCENCE. HOW BAPTISM VOIDS IT. CONCERNING THE LATE NOVELTY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ABOUT ORIGINAL SIN.

THIS enquiry must begin with the question about original sin, wherein it consists; because thereupon depends the question of the effect and consequence thereof, which is to say, what is the estate wherein the Gospel of Christ overtakes the natural man.

Wherein  
original sin  
consisteth.

§ 2. For it is well enough known, that there is a question yet on foot in the Church, whether original sin do consist in

What opi-  
nions are  
on foot.

<sup>h</sup> c. v.

<sup>i</sup> cc. xviii. xix.

BOOK  
II.

concupiscence, or in the want of original righteousness; which, having been planted in our first parents, their posterity ought to have<sup>k</sup>. And whosoever thinks there can be little difficulty in this dispute, little considers the difficulty that St. Augustin found in satisfying the Pelagians, how concupiscence can be taken away by baptism, which all Christians find to remain in the regenerate<sup>l</sup>: seeing there can be no question made, that original sin is taken away by baptism; Christianity pretending to take away all sin, and baptism being the solemn execution of Christianity, that is, the solemn profession of the Christian faith. This is evidently the only difficulty, that driveth so many of the school doctors to have recourse, not only to St. Anselm's device of the want of original righteousness<sup>m</sup>, but to another more extravagant speculation of a state of pure nature; which God might have

<sup>k</sup> "Non est autem quæstio inter nos et adversarios, sitne humana natura graviter depravata per Adæ peccatum. Id enim libenter fatemur. Neque etiam quæstio est, an hæc depravatio aliquo modo ad peccatum originale pertineat, ita ut materiale ejus peccati dici possit. . . . Sed tota controversia est, utrum corruptio naturæ, ac præsertim concupiscentia per se et ex natura sua, qualis invenitur etiam in baptizatis et justificatis, sit proprie peccatum originis. Id enim adversarii contendunt: Catholici autem negant; quippe qui, sanata voluntate per gratiam justificantem, docent reliquos morbos non solum non constituere homines reos, sed neque posse constituere, cum non habeant veram peccati rationem." Bellarm., *De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Peccati*, lib. v. c. 5; *Controv.*, tom. iii. p. 370. B—D.—"Si quis igitur a nobis quærat, quid proprie sit originale peccatum, respondebimus cum distinctione ad hunc modum. Si peccatum pro actione cum lege pugnante accipitur; peccatum originale est prima Adami inobedientia ab ipso Adamo commissæ, non ut erat singularis persona, sed ut personam totius generis humani gerebat. Si vero peccatum accipitur pro eo quod residet in homine post actionem, et unde idem homo non peccans sed peccator nominatur, peccatum originale est carentia doni justitiæ originalis, sive habitualis aversio et obliquitatis voluntatis, quæ et macula mentem Deo invisam reddens appellari

potest." Id., *ibid.*, c. 17; *ibid.*, p. 443. D.—"If this be soe, what then will some man say is the difference betweene the Romanists and those of the Reformed Churches? Surely it is very great. For these teach, that concupiscence was newly brought into the nature of man by Adam's sinne; that in the unregenerate it is properly sinne; that it maketh them guiltie and worthy of eternall condemnation, that have it. But the Romanists say, it was not newly brought in by Adam's fall; that it is a consequent of nature; that it is more free and at liberty to produce the proper effects of it now, then it would have beene, if grace had not been lost; but not more then it would have beene in nature simply considered without grace or sinne, and that it never made them guilty that had it." Field, *Of the Church*, Append. to Bk. iii. c. 8. pp. 273, 274. Oxf. 1628.

<sup>l</sup> See Voss, *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. ii. P. ii. Thes. 7 et Antith. 7; *Op.*, tom. vi. pp. 619, b, 620. a.

<sup>m</sup> "Huc respexerunt S. Anselmus in lib. de Conceptu Virginali, c. iii." (*Op.*, P. i. p. 98. 1. C; ed. Gerberon, Paris, 1675), "S. Thomas in 1. 2. Qu. 82. art. 3, S. Bonaventura, Scotus, Durandus, Gabriel, et alii in 2 Sent. d. 30; qui peccatum originis esse voluerunt carentiam justitiæ originalis debitæ inesse." Bellarm., *De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Pecc.*, lib. v. c. 17: *Controv.*, tom. iii. p. 422. D.



created man in, had He not thought more fit of His goodness to create him in a state of supernatural grace; that is to say, endowed with those gifts and graces, that might enable him to attain that happiness of the world to come, which is now promised to Christians<sup>n</sup>. This state of pure nature they hold to be liable to concupiscence; as the product, by consequence, of the principles of man's nature, compounded of a material and spiritual, a mortal and immortal substance, and originally inclined, the one to the sensual good of the body, the other to the spiritual good of the soul here, which the eternal good of it is consequent to in the world to come. The nature of man, liable to this condition, they say, was prevented by supernatural grace, as a bridle to rule and moderate the inclination of nature, not to come into effect so long as so overruled; but so that, this grace being forfeited by the rebellion of Adam, consequently it came into

CHAP.  
XX.

<sup>n</sup> "Sciendum igitur est primo, hominem naturaliter constare ex carne et spiritu, et ideo partim cum bestiis, partim cum Angelis communicare naturam; et quidem ratione carnis, et communionis cum bestiis, habere propensionem quamdam ad bonum corporale et sensibile, in quod fertur per sensum et appetitum: ratione spiritus, et communionis cum Angelis, habere propensionem ad bonum spirituale et intelligibile, in quod fertur per intelligentiam et voluntatem. Ex his autem diversis vel contrariis propensionibus existere in uno eodemque homine pugnam quandam, et ex ea pugna ingentem bene agendi difficultatem, dum una propensio alteram impedit. Sciendum secundo, Divinam providentiam initio creationis, ut remedium adhiberet huic morbo seu languori naturæ humanæ, qui ex conditione materiæ oriebatur; addidisse homini donum quoddam insigne, justitiam videlicet originalem, qua veluti aureo quodam fræno pars inferior parti superiori, et pars superior Deo, facile subjecta contineretur. Sic autem subjectam fuisse carnem spiritui, ut non posset ipso invito moveri, neque ei rebellis fieri, nisi ipse fieret rebellis Deo: in potestate tamen spiritus fuisse, rebellis Deo fieri et non fieri. . . . Adversarii censent rectitudinem illam, in qua creatus est Adam, fuisse illi naturam hoc . . . modo; nimirum quod veluti quædam sanitas debita aptaque nasci natura constituta, id est

et nunc hominibus, qui eam rectitudinem amiserunt in Adamo, deesse bonum aliquod naturale. . . . Nos vero existimamus rectitudinem illam etiam partis inferioris fuisse donum supernaturale, et quidem per se, non per accidens, ita ut neque ex naturæ principis fluxerit; neque potuerit fluere. Et quia donum illud supernaturale erat, . . . eo remoto, natura humana sibi relicta, pugnam illam experiri cœpit partis inferioris cum superiore, quæ naturalis futura erat, id est, ex conditione materiæ sequutura, nisi Deus justitiæ donum homini addidisset. Quare non magis differt status hominis post lapsum Adæ a statu ejusdem in puris naturalibus, quam differat spoliatus a nudo; neque deterior est humana natura, si culpam originalem detrahas, neque magis ignorantia et infirmitate laborat, quam esset et laboraret in puris naturalibus condita. Proinde corruptio naturæ, non ex alicujus doni naturalis carentia, neque ex alicujus malæ qualitatis accessu, sed ex sola doni supernaturalis ob Adæ peccatum amissione profluxit. Quæ sententia communis est doctorum scholasticorum veterum et recentiorum." Belarm., *De Gratia Primi Hominis*, c. v.; *Controv.*, tom. iiii. pp. 15. D—17. C.—See also note p below.—This doctrine is given up by Mochler, *Symbolism*, Bk. i. Pt. i. § 5 (pp. 74—76. Eng. Transl.), as a "speculation" of the schoolmen, "inadequate" to the purpose for which it was framed.

BOOK II. effect without more ado: and that, by consequence, original sin cannot consist in this opposition between the inclinations to sensual and spiritual good which man hath, but in the want of that grace from whence it proceedeth<sup>o</sup>.

[The importance of the controversy as against the Church of Rome, according to Dr. Field.]

§ 3. This controversy, Dr. Field, in his learned work of the Church, counteth to be of such consequence, that he maintaineth all the difference which the Reformation hath with the Church of Rome about justification, free will, the merit of good works, and the fulfilling of the law, and the like, to be grounded upon it; so that there can be no cause of difference, supposing it to be set aside<sup>p</sup>. His reason is, because the opinion of justification by inherent righteousness supposes, that the reluctance of our sensual principles to spiritual good can no way impeach it, as coming from the constitution of our nature, supposing the ornaments and additions of grace to be removed. The opinion of the fulfilling of God's law by Christians supposes, that the remains of concupiscence in the regenerate, and the immediate effects thereof in the first motions to sin, which cannot be prevented, are not against God's law, but only besides it. From whence it will follow, that he, who of his free will embraces Christianity, and perseveres in the good works which it enjoineeth, meriteth of justice the reward of the life to come<sup>q</sup>.

152

<sup>o</sup> See notes k, n, p.

<sup>p</sup> "They of the Church of Rome at this day imagine, that God might have created a man in the state of pure nature, or nature onely, as well without grace, as sinne; and that in this state of pure or meere nature, without any addition of grace, hee might have loved God above all, and have kept all the commaundments of God collectively, so as to breake none of them, at the least for a short time, though happily hee could not have holden on constantly so to keepe them all, as never to breake any of them: seeing there would have beene a contrariety, betweene reason, and that appetite that followeth the apprehension of sense, in that state of pure or meere nature. So that, according to this concept, grace was added not to inable man to love God above all, to keepe the severall commaundments, which Hee hath given, and to doe the workes of morall vertue (for all these he might have beene able to performe out of the power of nature,

without any such addition), but to make him able constantly to keepe all the commaundments of God collectively, so as never to breake any one of them, and to keepe them so as to merit eternall happiness in heaven. . . . Against these erroneous concepts, that are indeede the ground of all the points of difference, betweene them and us, touching originall sinne, free-will, the power of nature, the workes of infidels, and the like, we oppose this proposition," &c. Field, *Of the Church*, Append. to Bk. iii. c. 5. pp. 250, 251: quoting Cameracensis, Scotus, Bellarmine.—Moehler (*Symb.*, Bk. i. Pt. i § 1. pp. 31—33) agrees with Field so far, as to treat the diversity of doctrine respecting original sin as the logical though not the historical "centre of the disputes" between Romanists and Protestants.

<sup>q</sup> See the 5th and following chapters in Field, *Of the Church*, Append. to Bk. iii.; pp. 250 sq.



§ 4. And truly, for my part, I cannot deny, that all this is CHAP. XX.  
justly pleaded against those that are of this opinion, and cannot by them justly be answered. But that this opinion is enjoined by the Church of Rome, I cannot understand: seeing divers learned doctors of the schools alleged by Dr. Field for the opposition which he maketh to this opinion<sup>r</sup>, and that very truly and justly; shewing infallibly, that the contrary opinion is allowed to be maintained in the communion of the Church of Rome. And that nothing hath been done since the authors whom he allegeth, to make this unlawful to be held amongst them, I suppose it will be enough to produce the decree of the council of Trent<sup>s</sup>; since which it is evident, that it is lawful among them to maintain, that concupiscence is original sin. For though the decree declareth, that the Church never understood concupiscence in the regenerate to be truly and properly sin, but to be so called as proceeding from sin and inclining to sin: yet, inasmuch as it is one thing to speak of concupiscence in the regenerate, another in the unregenerate; and inasmuch as it is one thing to declare the sense of the Church according to the opinion of the synod, another, to condemn the contrary sense as opposite to the faith; it is manifest, that this declaration condemns not those that hold original concupiscence to be original sin, but only shews, that they could not answer the difficulty of original sin in the regenerate.

§ 5. On the other side, it cannot be justly said, so far as I understand, that those of the Reformation do affirm, that the grace given to Adam at his creation was due to his nature; in this sense and to this effect, as if they did intend to deny,

<sup>r</sup> Viz. Gregorius Ariminensis, Hugo de Sancto Victore, St. Bernard, Anselm, Peter Lombard, Grosthead, Bradwardine, Pupperus Gocchianus, Andradius, before the council of Trent; after that council, Didacus Alvarez: cited by Field, *ibid.*, c. 5. pp. 255—263.

<sup>s</sup> "Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, quæ in baptismo confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat; aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet; sed illud dicit tantum radi aut non imputari: anathema sit. In renatis enim nihil odit Deus," &c. "Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscentiam vel fomitem,

hæc sancta synodus fatetur ac sentit; quæ cum ad agonem relicta sit, nocere non consentientibus, et viriliter per Jesu Christi gratiam repugnantibus, non valet. . . . Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, sancta synodus declarat Ecclesiam Catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit: sed quia ex peccato est et ad peccatum inclinatur. Si quis autem contrarium senserit, anathema sit." Concil. Trident., Sess. v., Decret. de Pecc. Orig., c. 5; ap. Labb., Concil., tom. xiv. pp. 752. E, 753. A—C.

[What opinion is enjoined by the Church of Rome on the subject.]

[What by those of the Reformation.]

BOOK II. that he was created in such an estate and to such a condition of happiness, as the principles and constitution of his nature do not necessarily require : but only this, that the gifts which by his creation he stood endowed with, were necessary to the purchase of that happiness, which he, that is to say, his nature, was created to ; whereupon they are justly called the endowments of nature<sup>†</sup>.

§ 6. Here I must not omit the opinion of Catharinus in the council of Trent<sup>u</sup> : that Adam received original righteous-

That it is not Adam's sin imputed to his posterity.

<sup>†</sup> Field's opinion on the subject may be gathered from the following passage (Of the Church, Append. to Bk. iii. c. 5. pp. 252, 253) : " Wee (Protestants) say there neither was nor could be any power in nature as of it selfe to doe any act morally good, or not sinnefull; that grace was given to inable men to performe the actions of their principall powers about their principall objects, and to do good; and that, it being taken away, there is found in them an impotencie to doe any act of vertue; . . . that the difficulty to do good, pronenesse to evill, contrariety betweene the powers and faculties of the soule, and the rebellion of the meaner against the superiour and better, are not the conditions of nature as it was or might have bene in itself before the entrance of sinne, but that all these proceede from the putting of the powers of the soule by the loss of grace out of that course which by the law of God and nature they were to hold." Compare also p. 254: and Bellarm., De Grat. Primi Hom., c. v.; Controv., tom. iii. p. 16. B—D.

<sup>u</sup> Catharinus is described as arguing, that God, "justitiam originalem in Adamum totumque humanum genus conferens, cum eo omnium nomine pactus est, justitiam eam ab ipso suisque omnibus iri conservatum, servato scilicet mandato. Eo autem violato, justitiam eam tam aliis quam sibi amisit, eorumque nomine penas incurrit. Quæ pænæ ut in singulos derivatæ sunt, ita ipsam Adami transgressionem esse etiam singulorum : illius, tanquam causæ ; aliorum, virtute pactionis. Sic ut actio Adami, in ipso peccatum actuale, imputata cæteris hominibus, constituat originale peccatum : quod, eo peccante, totum genus humanum peccaverit. Opinionem suam Catarinus hoc imprimis firmamento fulciebat, quod verum et proprium peccatum nul-

lum sit nisi actus voluntarius ; voluntarium autem peccatum aliud non esse, nisi transgressionem Adami omnibus imputatam : atque illud D. Pauli, 'in Adamo omnes peccavisse,' non aliter intelligendum, nisi quod omnes idem cum ipso peccatum admiserint. In exemplum afferebat, quod D. Paulus ad Hebræos scribit, Levi decimas solvisse Melchisedecho, cum eisdem Abrahamus proavus ipsius solvisset. Quo aspectu dicendum, posteros mandatum Dei violasse, cum id violaret Adamus ; et in eo fuisse peccatores, sicut in eo justitiam acceperant. Itaque necesse non esse, recurrere ad libidinem, quæ carnem inficit, a qua anima contagio vitietur : quod vix intelligi possit, quomodo spiritus affectum corporeum admittat. Quod si peccatum macula sit spiritualis in anima, non poterat prius esse in carne. Sin vero in carne est corporea, non potest in spiritu effectum aliquem producere. Animam vero, propterea quod corpori infecto conjungatur, infectionem spiritualem accipere, id quidem certe humanum caput excedere putabat. Pactum Dei cum Adamo confirmabat testimonio Osæ prophetæ, et loco Scripturæ ex Ecclesiastico, et variis ex D. Augustini locis. Peccatum cujusque esse solum actum transgressionis Adami, ex D. Paulo probabat, cum ait 'per inobedientiam unius hominis multos factos peccatores : ' tum, quia in Ecclesia nunquam intellectum fuit peccatum esse aliud, quam actionem voluntariam contra legem ; aliam autem voluntariam actionem nullam fuisse, nisi Adami : tum etiam, quia D. Paulus dicit per peccatum originale mortem intrasse in mundum ; mors autem non per aliam intravit viam nisi actualis transgressionis. Denique pro Achilleo telo attulit, Evam, licet ante Adamum pomum comederit, tamen neque se nudam agnovisse, neque pœnam incurrisse,



ness of God, in his own name and the name of his posterity, to be continued to them, he obeying God; whereupon his disobedience is, in law, their disobedience, though in nature only his; and the act of his transgression, imputed to them, is their original sin, as personal as the penalties of it: no otherwise than Levi "paid tithes in Abraham." Many passages of St. Augustin<sup>x</sup> he had to allege for this; as also a text of the prophet Osee<sup>y</sup>, and another of Ecclesiasticus<sup>z</sup>: but especially the express words of St. Paul, that "by the inobedience of one man many are made sinners;" and that "by sin death came into the world;" which surely came into the world by the actual transgression of God's commandment: alleging, that Eve found not herself naked till Adam had eaten the forbidden fruit; nor had original sin been, had the matter rested there<sup>a</sup>. And by this reason he thought he avoided a difficulty not to be overcome otherwise;—how the lust of generation can give a spiritual stain to the soul, which must needs be carnal, if it come from the flesh<sup>b</sup>. And by this means nothing but an action which transgresseth God's law shall be sin, which all men understand by that name. This opinion, the history saith<sup>c</sup>, was the more plausible among the prelates

CHAP.  
XX.

[Heb. vii.  
9.]

[Rom. v.  
19.]

[Rom. v.  
12.]

nisi post Adæ admissum. Itaque sicut Adami peccatum, non illi proprium fuit, sed etiam Evæ: ita posterorum etiam omnium." Paolo Sarpi, Hist. Concil. Trident., lib. ii. p. 138. August. Trinob. 1620.—See also Catharinus himself, in his Summa Doctrinæ de Peccato Originali, pp. 39. b. sq. Rom. 1550; and Discept. de Natura Peccati Originalis, being the 3rd of the "Disceptationes," addressed by him to his opponent Dominic. Soto, pp. 45, b. sq. Rom. 1551.

<sup>x</sup> "Unde etiam B. Augustinus in libro de nuptiis et concupiscentia cap. xi." (§ 24; Op., tom. x. p. 313. A, B) "acutely de more tractans illum locum Genes. xvii. de pacto circumcisionis; id quod ibi dicitur: 'Masculus cujus præputiū caro circumcisa non fuerit, delebitur anima illa de populo suo; quia pactum Meum irritum fecit:' refert ad pactum cum Adam factum." Cathar., Discept. de Nat. Pecc. Orig., p. 47. b.—&c.

<sup>y</sup> "Nunquid non ego in opusculis nostris produxi Oseam præm<sup>o</sup> ait, 'Sicut Adam tran-

tum, ibi prævaricati sunt in Me'" (Hos. vi. 7. Vulg.). Id., ibid., p. 47. a.—"They like men" (in marg. "Adam) have transgressed," &c. Hos. vi. 7. Eng. vers.

<sup>z</sup> "Sapiens etiam in Ecclesiastico de primis parentibus manifeste testatur, quod Dominus constituit testamentum cum illis" (Ecclus. xvii. 10. Vulg., 12. Gk. Eng. vers.). "Quid est testamentum nisi pactum?" Id., ibid., p. 47. b.

<sup>a</sup> See end of note u.

<sup>b</sup> See note u.

<sup>c</sup> "Post theologorum censuram cum a Patribus de constituenda forma decreti ageretur, quod ex Episcopis perpauci solida theologiæ cognitione præditi essent, sed vel consulti juris vel ad modum aulæ disciplinis leviter tincti, e scholasticorum tricis et spinosa rerum tractandarum ratione vix sese expediebant, atque, propter opinionum conflictum, de essentia peccati originalis quid statuendum esset, non satis perspiciebant. Catarini certe opinio, nam ille adumbraverat imagine qualistica, pacti ab uno, successorum

BOOK  
II.

[This opinion of Catharinus condemned.]

[Rom. vii. 23.]

[Gal. v. 17—23.]

[Rom. v. 12—19.]

there, as not bred divines, but canonists, or versed in business; and so best relishing that which they best understood, to wit, the conceit of a civil contract with Adam, in behalf of his posterity, as well as himself.

§ 7. To give a judgment of this opinion, I shall do no more but remit the reader to those Scriptures, which I have produced<sup>d</sup> to shew that there is such a thing as original sin; concluding, that the nature of it, wherein it consists, must be valued by the evidence of it, whereby it appears that it is. It will then be unavoidable, that, when death is the effect of sin, because righteousness is the cause of life, as Adam's sin is the cause of his death, so the death of his posterity depends upon their own unrighteousness. Why else should Christianity free us from death, as hath been shewed<sup>e</sup>? Why<sup>153</sup> should St. Paul complain of the law that he found in his members, opposing the law of righteousness? Why should the flesh fight with the Spirit, and the fruits of the flesh be opposite to the fruits of the Spirit, but that the same opposition of sin to righteousness is to be acknowledged in the habitual principles, as in the actual effects which proceed from the same? As for that only text of St. Paul, in which he could find any impression of his meaning: if the reader observe the deduction, whereby I have shewed<sup>f</sup>, that St. Paul's discourse obliged him to set forth the ground, whereupon the coming of Christ and His Gospel became necessary to the salvation both of the Jews and Gentiles; he will easily find, that the question is of the effective, not of the formal cause; that St. Paul is not engaged to shew, wherein that source of sin which our Lord Christ came to cure consisteth, but from whence it proceedeth. True it is, when the posterity suffers loss of estate and honour for the father's treason, it may properly be said, that the father's crime is imputed to the posterity: not because any reason can endure, that what is done by one man should be thought to be done by another; but because the effect of what one man does, may justly be either granted to or inflicted upon another, whether for the

nomine facti, cujus violatione posteriores haud dubie obligarentur; sicut ad illorum captum proxime accedebat, ita plurimos e Patribus habuit fautores; eam tamen, quod Theologi contradice-

rent, approbare non ausis." Paolo Sarpi, Hist. Concil. Trident., lib. ii. p. 140.

<sup>d</sup> cc. xviii., xix. § 1—5.

<sup>e</sup> c. xviii. § 3.

<sup>f</sup> c. x. § 8—10.



better or for the worse. As in a civil state: suppose the laws make treason to forfeit lands and honours, which every man sees are held by virtue of the laws; that posterity, which hath no right to them but from predecessors, and the obligation which they had to maintain the state, should forfeit them by the act of predecessors, is a thing not strange but reasonable: though so, that the forfeiture may transgress the bounds of reason and humanity, if the law should not allow posterity or kindred to live in that state to which predecessors have forfeited, when there is so much cause to believe, that the forfeiture may be an instruction to them, if once they believe that it was by just law. This justice then, and the ground of it, is the only reason why the predecessor's fault is truly said to be imputed to his posterity. But between God and mankind in the forfeit of Adam, by the precept given him, there cannot be understood any contract; by virtue whereof posterity, that did not the act, can be liable to the punishment of it.

§ 8. And therefore we must distinguish between the imputing of one man's sin to another formally, so as to punish a man for another man's sin; which, if he concurred to the act, may be just, otherwise not: and effectively, in the nature of a meritorious cause (which reduceth itself to the effective), when, in consideration of one man's sin, another is made subject to that evil which he should have been free from otherwise. And according to this distinction, though the posterity of Adam is liable to much evil in consideration of his sin, yet is not this evil properly the punishment of it, but the effect of the same will of God in propagating mankind with the stain of concupiscence, which takes place in maintaining understanding creatures to do all that sin, which God might have hindered them from doing, had He not thought it better to draw good out of evil than utterly to prevent it. And this is no more, than the correspondence between the first and second Adam, which St. Paul proceeds upon Rom. v., inferreth. For I have shewed already<sup>e</sup>, that the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to any man formally and immediately; so as to say, that any man is justified by God's

CHAP.  
XX.

[Formal and effective imputation distinguished.]

[Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45 —49.]

BOOK deputed our Lord Christ for his benefit personally, exclud-  
 II. ing those for whom He was not deputed : and I have shewed again<sup>h</sup>, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to all Christians effectively, and in the nature of a meritorious cause ; inasmuch as I have shewed, that those helps of grace, without which no man is able to embrace Christianity as it is to be embraced, are granted by God in consideration of His merits and sufferings, laid out to that purpose. And that which remaineth for me to shew in due place, is this ; that that disposition, which qualifyeth for the promises of the Gospel, being brought to pass in any man by those helps, obliges not God to grant those promises, which the Gospel rewards it with, by any worth in itself, but by virtue of God's grace, in consideration of Christ's merits and sufferings, laid out to that purpose. By which correspondence it may appear, that those who can persuade themselves, that the posterity of<sup>154</sup> Adam are bound to answer for the sin of his fall as their own act, cannot stand bound to acknowledge a Christian (to whom the merits of the sufferings of Christ are imputed upon the same terms) obliged to any condition, upon which his right to the promises of the Gospel can depend ; being once due to him by virtue of Christ's merits and sufferings, deputed to be personally his. As, on the contrary, those that acknowledge the merits and sufferings of Christ to be justly imputed to the persons of those, whom He was sent to redeem, cannot stand bound to acknowledge the posterity of the first Adam to be liable to concupiscence by his fall ; seeing the coming of Christ for the redemption of those, whom God thereby should please to exempt from the common imputation thereof, would be no less effectual to the voiding of that condemnation which it contracted, than supposing whatever disease of our nature concupiscence (coming in by his fall) may signify. So that, supposing the immediate and personal imputation of the fall of Adam to all his posterity, of the merits and suffering of Christ to all those for whom they are appointed, the evil which mankind suffereth by the means of Adam's fall is properly the punishment of his sin, the good which it receiveth by the means of Christ's sufferings is the reward of it ; nor can have any dependance

<sup>h</sup> c. vii. § 7.



upon any act of his free will, otherwise than as that which God worketh by him, not as that which He requireth at his hands. But, supposing the meritorious imputation of Adam's fall and Christ's righteousness, the evil which his posterity lies under by means of it, will not be properly the punishment of sin (because not the recompense of the evil which a man does, by the evil which he suffers<sup>1</sup>); though properly a penalty, because an evil inflicted in consideration of sin.

§ 9. Now, supposing that Adam understood the precept, "In the day thou eatest thereof shalt thou die the death," to condemn his posterity as well as himself: it is manifest notwithstanding, that the obligation thereof was not by virtue of his accepting of it, and contracting upon it, but original, by virtue of that being which God had bestowed; and therefore taking hold of all his posterity, on whom He meant to bestow it. Wherefore, though it is handsomely called by St. Augustin<sup>k</sup>, and others<sup>1</sup>, a covenant of God with mankind, which, being transgressed by Adam, forfeited the benefit thereof to his posterity: yet, to speak properly, it was the mere appointment of God, in that which lay in His power and right to appoint; that the uprightness wherein Adam was created should descend to his posterity, he continuing in it; otherwise, the propagation thereof should be maintained, the uprightness failing.

§ 10. Nor can any man think [it] strange, that Christianity should oblige us to believe this; if we consider the many and strange extravagances, which those, who either acknowledge not Christianity or have fallen from it, do run into by not resting in it: the Epicureans, and (as some think<sup>m</sup>) the Peripatetics, denying providence; the Stoics, free-will, and so the same providence; the Pythagoreans (whom the Plato-

CHAP.  
XX.

[How Adam's sin descended to his posterity.]  
[Gen. ii. 17.]

[Extravagances into which they fall who deny original sin.]

<sup>1</sup> Punishment is defined to be "malum passionis quod infligitur propter malum actionis." Grotius, de Jure Belli et Pacis, II. xx. 1; Puffendorf, De Jure Naturæ et Gentium, VIII. iii. 4.

<sup>k</sup> "Tunc ergo dissipavit testamentum Dei, non hoc de imperata circumcissione, sed illud de Ligni prohibitionem, quando per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum," &c. S. Aug., De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia, lib. ii. c. xi. § 24: On. tom. x. p. 313, B; speaking

of the infant uncircumcised the eighth day:—quoted by Catharinus as above in § 6. note x.

<sup>1</sup> e. g. "Ipsi autem imitati sunt Adam; ut quod ille in paradiso fecerat, pactum Meum legemque præteriens, isti in terra facerent." S. Hieron., In Oseam Prophet., lib. ii. in c. vi. v. 7; Op., tom. iv. p. 1276: quoted by Catharinus, *ibid.*

<sup>m</sup> See Brucker, Hist. Philos., P. ii. lib. ii. c. 7. § 18.

BOOK  
II.

tics are entangled with, and the ancient Gnostics, Marcionites, and Manichees, manifestly imitate) setting up two Gods, one the author of evil, the other of good; the heathen worshipping in effect the devil, whom those sects set up under the name of author of evil; the Jews and Mahometans (if they have any thing to say to the original of evil in mankind, to whose use God hath commended the world) being obliged to say, that it comes from the fall of Adam; Pelagians and Socinians, not confessing what Jews and Mahometans cannot deny, but not able to give any account, why the noble creature of mankind should be so overspread with evil, coming from a good God, and accountable for his own actions.

[All questions not necessary to be answered.]

§ 11. The question thus stated, and Christianity tendering, first, the fall of bad angels, and the seducing of Adam by their malice, and in consequence thereunto of the greatest part of mankind, to the worship of evil angels by whom they were seduced (excepting those, whom God dealt with by His word, ministered by angels first, then by His Son, Whose Gospel now is preached); I suppose there is nothing wanting, to evidence either the truth or obligation of it: though those that preach it are not enabled to evidence, why God<sup>155</sup> pleased to suspend the uprightness of Adam's posterity upon the condition of his obedience, whenas it is evident enough that it was in His power to have done otherwise.

[Why Eve fell not until Adam also had sinned.]

§ 12. And this account being rendered, it will be easy to say, why Eve found not the effect of her transgression, before Adam had eaten the forbidden fruit: to wit, not because she should never have found any, had not he sinned; but because the effects of it do not necessarily follow instantly at all times, and in all things; and that, in tempting Adam, which was the next thing she did, they did instantly appear.

[No need to determine the mode of the propagation of man's soul.]

§ 13. As for the great difficulty, how the spiritual substance of the soul should receive a taint from the carnal concupiscence, whereby it cometh to be united to the body; I will here challenge the benefit of that principle which

<sup>a</sup> See above, § 6. note u: and Ca-  
tharinus, Summ. Doctrin. De Pecc.  
Orig., § Quod Orig. Peccatum est ip-

sum Actuale Adæ n. 42 a; "Nun-  
quam enim erui  
quam comedit



I have once established<sup>o</sup>, that [that] which once was not CHAP.  
XX.  
 matter of faith, can never, by process of time or any act the Church can do, become matter of faith: though we may become more obliged to believe it, not by the general obligation of Christianity, but by having studied the reasons by which it is deduced from the principles of faith, besides that light of reason which faith presupposeth; and, by the same reason, the Church may justly enjoin it to be received, that is to say, not openly contradicted. For such is the matter of the propagation of man's soul; whether by transplanting, as part of the fathers hold, or by immediate existence from God in the body which nature prepareth for it<sup>p</sup>: which, having been manifestly disputable in St. Augustin's time<sup>q</sup>, I hold it very consequent to that which I have done in the point of the Trinity<sup>r</sup>, whether it may be made evident to reason or not, to leave it without producing any man's reason, by which I pretend to maintain that it is either traduced or created; always supposing, that no reason can be receivable, which provideth not for the immortality of it, which no man questions.

§ 14. Lastly, it is manifest, that actual sin is first called by the name of sin, because first subject to sense; but so, that the displeasure of God, and by consequence the name of sin, is no less real against habitual sins. So I will confess further (as afore<sup>s</sup> of the terms of "essence" and "person" in the mystery of the blessed Trinity, that they were brought into the Church to prevent the malice of heretics, and to settle a right understanding in that which was necessary to

[The term, original sin, when and by whom introduced.]

<sup>o</sup> Above, c. xvii. § 10.

<sup>p</sup> Traducianism--Creatianism.--"Vos vero soli nos appellatis Traducianos." S. Aug. addressing the Pelagians, Op., Imperf. cont. Julian., lib. i. c. 75; Op., tom. x. p. 919. E.—See the summary of the question in Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. ii. P. iii. Thes. 1; Op., tom. vi. pp. 624. a—626. a; as far as it bears upon the Pelagian heresy.

<sup>q</sup> "Hic forte dicat (Vincentius Victor), sententiam suam Divina auctoritate defendi; quoniam sanctorum Scripturarum testimoniis probare se existimat, animas a Deo non ex propagine fieri, sed novas singulis insufflari. Probat, si potest, et fatebor me didicisse

ab illo quod magna intentione quærebam." S. Aug., De Anima et Ejus Origine, lib. i. c. xiv. § 17; Op., tom. x. p. 346. A.—"Scripturarum vero testimonia quæcumque posuit (Vinc. Victor), quibus animas Deum non ex illius primæ propagine adtrahere, sed sicut ipsam primam suas quibusque singulis insufflare, velut probare conatus est, ita sunt, quod ad istam quæstionem adtinet, incerta et ambigua, ut etiam aliter accipi, quam ipse vult, facillime possint." Id., ibid., lib. ii. c. xiv. § 19; ibid., p. 368. D, E.

<sup>r</sup> Above, c. xvii. § 32—38.

<sup>s</sup> Above, c. xvii. § 30, 36.

BOOK  
II.

be received by Christians ; so now), that the term of "original sin" was first brought in by St. Augustin<sup>t</sup>, and the Church of his time ; to express that ground upon which the Church had from the beginning maintained the grace of our Lord Christ, and the necessity of it : but that this ground is not to be maintained, unless we acknowledge, besides those habits of sin which we contract, an habitual inclination to sin bred in our nature from the fall of Adam ; which may be called sin, in regard of the likeness and correspondence of it to and with other inclinations to sin contracted by custom.

Whether  
man were  
at the first  
created to a  
superna-  
tural end,  
or not.

§ 15. Having thus set aside this opinion, before I come to decide the difficulty proposed, I hold it necessary to debate that which both parts seem to take for granted, neither of them having expressed any reason to oblige us so to take it : that is, whether Adam were created to supernatural happiness (which is that which Christians now expect in the presence of God for everlasting), and therefore endowed with those graces, which might make him capable of it ; or only in a state of natural happiness, consisting in the content of this life only, and supposing perfect obedience to God in the course of it. Were it but for the repute I have of Grotius for his skill in the Scriptures (who, in one of his Annotations upon Cassander<sup>u</sup>, hath declared this opinion for part of his judgment), I should count it worth the debating. But I have found it further maintained by reasons<sup>x</sup>, which seem to me considerable, and no way prejudicial to the faith : which, notwithstanding, I do not intend to propose for mine own, engaging myself to maintain this ; but to confront with the reasons brought for it what I find reasonable to be said on the other side, that in a nice and obscure point the

<sup>t</sup> "Confitearis ergo necesse est, originale quod finxeras, interiisse peccatum."

Julianus, addressing St. Augustin ; ap. S. Aug., De Nuptiis et Concupisc., lib. ii. c. xii. § 25 ; Op., tom. x. p. 314. A.—See Voss., Hist. Pelag., lib. ii. P. i. Thes. 6 ; Op., tom. vi. p. 604. b.

<sup>u</sup> "Homo cum primum est conditus, promissa nulla habuit vitæ cœlestis, sed terrestris tantum. Itaque et vires ei datæ sunt tali præmio respondentes. Alia enim est imago Dei ad quam Adamus est conditus, alia ad quam per Christum nascimur." Grot., An-

not. ad Consult. Cassandri, Ad Art. ii. ; Op., tom. iii. p. 615. a.

<sup>x</sup> "Ex iis quæ hactenus a nobis disputata sunt, aperte colligitur, non solum in magno errore illos versari, sed in Christum etiam injurios esse, qui primos parentes nostros immortales creatos fuisse contendunt. Hunc enim primum, ut satis jam demonstratum est, immortalitatis et præconem et datorem, Deus esse voluit." Volkel, De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. ii. p. proceeding to establish ' arguments noticed :



discreet reader may choose, what he shall think most fit to allow. CHAP. XX.

§ 16. Now all the argument, that can be drawn into con-  
sequence on either side, arising from the relation of Moses  
156 compared with such texts of the New Testament as may give  
light to it: it is first argued, that, seeing "God first framed  
man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the  
breath of life, and man became a living soul," it seemeth  
evident, that he was made in a state of natural life only;  
St. Paul having said, in comparing him with Christ (1 Cor.  
xv. 45), "So also it is written, The first man Adam became  
a living soul, the last Adam became a quickening spirit;"  
meaning to say, that, as Moses saith, that Adam "became a  
living soul," so (not that Moses saith, but that Christians  
may say, that) Christ is "become a quickening spirit." For  
hereupon it follows in St. Paul, that, as that which is spiritual  
was to follow, so that which is natural or animal was to go  
before<sup>y</sup>. But to this, on behalf of the other part, methinks it  
may be said; that Moses, as all the Old Testament, speaks  
only of the state of our natural life, but intends by the cor-  
respondence between material and spiritual things, as the  
figure and that which it figures, to signify to us that which  
belongs to that spiritual life, which the Gospel introduces:  
of which intent, all that I have produced to settle that dif-  
ference between the literal and mystical sense of the Old  
Testament, is evidence<sup>z</sup>. So that God's breathing the breath  
of life into man's nostrils is the figure of His breathing the  
spiritual life of grace into the soul; which divers ancient

[Argu-  
ments on  
both sides.

[Gen. ii.  
7.]

[1 Cor. xv.  
46.]

[Gen. ii.  
7.]

<sup>y</sup> "Operæ pretium esse arbitror, ut hominis materiam paulo diligentius inspiciamus. Ea vero duplex est, remota (ut vocant), et proxima. Remota est terra, a qua Adami nomen deductum est. Sic enim dicit Moses, 'Formavit Dominus Deus hominem pulverem de humo.' Proxima materia est ipsum corpus humanum una cum omnibus suis tum exterioribus tum interioribus membris, ad cujus contemplationem quatuor illæ elementorum qualitates inter se pugnantur concurrunt. Sive igitur remotam sive proximam hominis materiam spectes, facile comperies, hominem sua natura mortuam corruptibilemque esse. . . . Quid illud esse, inquiet quispiam, quod

Paulus primum hominem in animam viventem factum fuisse dicit? aut etiam quod Moses, ex quo ista deprompta sunt, asserit, Deum in hominis faciem vel nares inspirasse spiraculum vitæ? . . . Respondemus autem, vel his ipsis Scripturæ testimoniis nostram de hominis statu, in quo ante lapsum fuit, sententiam mirum in modum confirmari. Tantum enim abest, ut factum esse in animam viventem, vel spiraculum vitæ sibi inspiratum habere, immortalitatis contineat argumentum; ut potius ei a Paulo luculentissime opponatur," &c. Id., ibid., pp. 67, 69. And see before in the same chapter, p. 67.

<sup>z</sup> Above, cc. v. § 5, 10; viii. § 14; &c.

BOOK II. fathers of the Church have understood to be signified by the same word<sup>a</sup>: and that, according to the true ground and rule of expounding the Scripture, if they suppose the breath of natural life, signified first by the same words, to be inspired as a figure of the spiritual life of grace. To which agrees well enough that which follows; that man "became a living soul:" in correspondence to the second Adam, Who "is become a quickening spirit," according to St. Paul. For Christ "is become a quickening spirit," because He shall raise the mortal bodies of those in whom His Spirit dwelt here; but Adam, though we suppose him to be "made a living soul" in respect of the life of grace, yet had that life from the Spirit of grace, the fulness whereof dwelt in Christ.

[Coloss. i. 19; ii. 9.]

§ 17. On the other side, it is argued: that seeing man was made "in the image of God, and His likeness," Gen. i. 26, 27, ix. 6; and that the image of God consists in that "righteousness and true holiness" to which Christians are regenerated by grace, Ephes. iv. 24; Col. iii. 9, 10; therefore man was first created in that "righteousness and true holiness," to which Christians are renewed, which renewing is called therefore "the new man" by St. Paul<sup>b</sup>. To this it may be answered on behalf of the other part, that the dominion over the creatures belongs to the image of God in man; according to the words of Moses, "Let Us make man after Our image and likeness, and let him bear rule over the fishes of the sea:" and therefore God requireth a man's blood of his brother, and of beasts, "because he was made in the image of God," Gen. ix. [5,] 6: so that the image of God re-

[Gen. i. 26.]

<sup>a</sup> S. Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. iii. c. 37. p. 264. a.—S. Cyprian., Ad. Pompeium, Epist. lxxiv. p. 213.—S. Basil. M., Homil. in Psalm. xlviii. § 8; Op., tom. i. pp. 184. E, 185. A.—&c.

<sup>b</sup> "Urgent nihilominus" (scil. the opponents of Volkelius), "et hominem ad Dei imaginem factum esse, idque nisi Deo immortalitate similis fuerit, cum vero conjunctum minime esse pugnabunt. Nos autem hoc posterius falsissimum esse dicimus, cum nihil impediatur, quominus homo non solum mortalis, sed morti etiam plane obnoxius, Dei imago esse dicique possit. Nam

et apud Mosen (Genes. ix. 6), et apud Jacobum (iii. 9), hominem post illam Adami ruinam titulo isto decoratum fuisse, scriptum legimus. . . . Longe aliam istius rei rationem in Divinis literis expressam videmus, nimirum quia, haud aliter atque Deus quispiam, omnes res creatas cœlo subjectas imperio suo complectatur. . . . Quod idem et David homini tribuit (Ps. viii. 7—9), dum illi imperium in universa Dei opera datum esse affirmat." Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. iii. c. xi. pp. 70, 71.



maineth, true righteousness and holiness being lost. And therefore it seemeth, that, according to the natural state of man, he is made according to God's image in regard of this dominion over the creatures; but according to that spiritual estate which the gospel calleth us to, much more, in regard of the dominion over sin and concupiscence, which the spirit of righteousness and true holiness bringeth with it: though both derivative from the image of God in Christ, to Whom the Apostle, Heb. ii. 6—9, ascribeth that dominion as to the second Adam, which the Psalmist setteth forth in the first, Psalm viii. 5—8<sup>c</sup>.

§ 18. And if it be said (as I said it may be<sup>d</sup>), that the precept given to them, forbidding the fruit of the tree of knowledge, is manifestly carnal, and concerning their nature; it is easy to say, on the other side, that the garden, and those trees, and therefore the precept concerning them, are not understood, if they be not taken as symbolical and mystical: to signify that, which St. Augustin in two words of free-will and Christ comprehendeth<sup>e</sup>; that, as the source of death is to satisfy the appetite of our own particular profit or pleasure, so to satisfy the appetite of that true goodness, which that Word or Wisdom of God (Which now incarnate is our Lord Christ) teacheth, is the fountain of life. Not as if there were not two such fruits, one granted to preserve life, the other forbidden on pain of death; but because they not only did signify (which the other opinion may grant), but also were understood by Adam to signify, more: as I have said<sup>g</sup>.

§ 19. As for the giving of names to living creatures, which is commonly made an argument of more than human wisdom in Adam, to wit, from God's Spirit<sup>h</sup>: I conceive the other side may say, that no names can signify the natures of things, but some sensible properties, by which they are known and discerned; so that to give names ingeniously argues no more,

<sup>c</sup> See the last note.

<sup>d</sup> Above, c. x. § 9.

<sup>e</sup> Scil. in his treatise entitled *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*; Op., tom. x. pp. 717 sq. See especially c. v. § 10. p. 723. D.

<sup>f</sup> pp. 153—156 (both inclusive) are by mistake repeated in the paging of the folio edition.

<sup>g</sup> See above, c. x. § 8—10.

<sup>h</sup> "Adamum quoque ante peccatum novisse naturas rerum, quas nunc ignoramus, satis aperte colligitur ex cap. ii. Genes.; ubi nomina imposuit omnibus animantibus, ut natura uniuscujusque exigere videbatur." Bellarm., *De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Pecc.*, lib. vi. c. 14; *Controv.*, tom. iii. p. 498. B.

BOOK II. than taking due notice of those things, which sense discovers to be most remarkable in each kind; and that not above the pitch of nature.

[How far  
Adam a  
prophet.]  
[Gen. ii.  
23, 24.]

§ 20. But when Adam says, "This is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh;" and, "Therefore shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh;" and St. Paul thereupon, Ephes. v. 32, "This mystery is great, but I mean as to Christ and the Church:" there is appearance, that the fathers have reason to suppose Adam a prophet<sup>i</sup>, not only to say the words which foretell the coming of Christ and the effect of it, but also to understand the meaning which they contained. Not as if he foresaw the incarnation of Christ, which supposed his own fall; but because, by that Word of God Which spoke to him in his trance, he understood, that his posterity should be united and married to God. And yet, on the other side, it may be said without prejudice to Christianity; that, though this is certainly the mystical sense of these words, yet it is no more necessary that Adam, when he spoke them, should understand it, than that the rest of those, who were figures of Christ by their actions in the Old Testament, did understand that they were so, much less wherein that figure consisted.

[Of the  
temptation  
under  
which  
Adam  
fell.]

§ 21. Last of all, it seems strange, that Adam should so easily be cast down with so slight a temptation, supposing that he was endowed with that divine wisdom which God's Spirit giveth; which will be no such marvel, if we suppose him to know no more than the conduct of his natural life in paradise might require. Which notwithstanding, this is no such advantage as it may seem. For, as the description of paradise and the two trees and the precept concerning them, so is also the temptation, delivered in symbolical terms; under the figure of that which concerned the preservation of their life, representing all that may move the sons of the first Adam

<sup>i</sup> "Nam et illud quod dicit Apostolus, 'Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia:' ipse Adam dixit, 'Propter hoc relinquet homo matrem et patrem, et adhærebit uxori suæ, et erunt duo in carne una.' Quod tamen Dominus Jesus in Evangelio Deum dixisse commemorat: quia Deus utique per homi-

nem dixit, quod homo prophetando prædixit." S. Aug., De Nupt. et Concupisc., lib. ii. c. iv. § 12; Op., tom. x. p. 307. A.—"Hebræi, . . hæc (Gen. ii. 24) a Spiritu Sancto prolata esse sentiunt. Cui adstipulatur et Christus Matt. xix. 4." Fagius ad Gen. ii. 24; ap. Crit. Sac., tom. i. p. 54.



to fall away from God. And whatsoever be the reason that it is called the tree of knowledge; to be like unto God, and that by a way of such knowledge as should not depend on God's will but their own choice, may easily be understood to be the most dangerous temptation, that an estate of so much advantage was capable of: how difficult soever it be to understand by the words, how they might believe it to depend upon eating the forbidden fruit. And as the state of mere nature (requiring the knowledge of so few things as the leading of such a life in obedience to God required) must needs infer that simplicity and innocence, that made them more liable to be tempted; so, a state of supernatural knowledge by the Spirit of God withdrawing their consideration from inferior things of this world to be conversant about the matters of God, they might be exposed to temptation as well by not attending, as by not apprehending the things of the world. As, on the other side, they were fortified against it, no less by that innocence and simplicity, which made them not sensible of that which provoketh it, than by that resolution of God's Spirit, which set them above it.

CHAP.  
XX.

[Gen. ii.  
17; iii. 5.]

§ 22. These being the considerations, which appear to me in those things which the Scriptures propose unto us of this estate, I will not stick to say, that I hold the common opinion to be the more probable, for two reasons: the first, because it seemeth to me far more consequent to the effect of man's fall (which is the loss and want of spiritual grace, necessary to the conduct of him in his spiritual life here, to eternal life in the world to come), that he should have transgressed and forfeited the means thereof, than only that innocence, that should have enabled him to yield God obedience only in an estate of mere nature, and to the purpose of it; secondly, because I find it to be received by the fathers of the Church

[The common opinion the more probable, though no article of faith.]

154 after St. Irenæus<sup>1</sup>, who seemeth to have delivered it in express  
tis.

<sup>1</sup> "Quoniam, inquit (Adam), eam quam habui a Spiritu, sanctitatis stolam amisi per inobedientiam," &c. Iren., Adv. Hær., lib. iii. c. 37. p. 264. a.—  
"Hac paraphrasi significatur, Adamum et justitiam originalem, et gratiam gratum facientem seu charitatem, quam initio acceperat, peccato suo perdidisse: qua de re et supra dictum est, cap. 20" (p. 245

recuperasse quod in Adam perdidimus.' Quod et Cyprianus postea docuit, scribens, illum acceptum Divinitus gratiam non custodisse, Serm. de Bono Patientiæ. Ambrosius quoque ait in cap. x. Luc., 'Angelos tenebrarum velut latrones indumentis gratiæ salutaris hominem spoliasset, cum in eos incidit.'" Feuard. in loc. S. Irenæi.

in Christo

BOOK  
II.

and clear terms. And yet I must say, on the other side, that I find it no reason to count it a matter of faith, but only the more reasonable supposition among divines; so that the matter of faith concerning original sin is more easily understood to depend upon it, and more reasonably inferred from it, and maintained by it. Not only, because you see the reasons out of the Scriptures so balanced; but chiefly, because I see the subject of the dispute to be all upon the literal and mystical sense of these Scriptures: without the knowledge whereof, I am confident the faith of a Christian is entire, though the skill of a divine is nothing. And for the consent of the fathers, how general soever it be after Irenæus, I have the authority of the same Irenæus<sup>k</sup>, backed by his reason (in that excellent chapter, where he distinguishes between the tradition of faith, and the skill of the Scriptures), to resolve me, that neither this point, nor any other point which depends upon the agreement between the Old Testament and the New, as this does, can belong to the faith of a Christian, but only to the skill of a divine.

An estate of mere nature, but innocent, possible.

§ 23. But now, this being premised and settled, it will be easy for me to infer, that a state of mere nature is a thing very possible; had it pleased God to appoint it, by proposing no higher end than natural happiness, no harder means than original innocence, to man whom He had made: the reasons premised sufficiently serving to shew, that there is no contradiction in the being of that, which there is so much appearance that it was indeed.

[But not as the schoolmen and St. Augustine suppose.]

§ 24. But I must advise you withal, that I mean it upon a far other supposition, than that of the school doctors. They, supposing that man was created to that estate of supernatural happiness to which the Gospel pretendeth to regenerate Christians, hold, that it was God's mere free grace, that he was not created with that contradiction between the reason and appetite, which the principles of his nature are of them-

<sup>k</sup> "Ostensio neque plus neque minus de ea quæ est fide posse quosdam dicere." tit. of S. Iren. Adv. Hær., lib. i. c. 3. (p. 46).—"Secundum quid fiat, putare alios quidem plus, alios vero minus habere agnitionis." tit. of c. 4. (p. 47). *ibid.*—Among the subjects not de fide, and so open to the various de-

grees of skill and knowledge in divines, specified in c. 4, are, "διὰ τί διαθήκαι πλείους γέγονασι τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι, μὴ νύειν, καὶ τίς ἐκάστης τῶν διαθηκῶν ὁ χαρακτήρ, διδάσκειν" (c. 4. p. 47. a): and, "πῶς τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο σαρκίον ἐνδύσεται ἀθανασίαν, καὶ τὸ φθαρτὸν ἀφθαρσίαν διαγγέλλειν" (*ibid.*, p. 48. a).



selves apt to produce<sup>1</sup>. Whereupon it followeth, that concupiscence is God's creature, that is, the endowment of it; signifying by concupiscence that contrariety to reason, which the disorder of sensual appetite produceth: a saying, that hath fallen from the pen of St. Augustin, and that after his business with Pelagius (*Retract.* i. 9<sup>m</sup>; allowing what he had writ to that purpose against the Manichees in his third Book *De Libero Arbitrio*<sup>n</sup>; which he mentioneth again, and no way disalloweth, in his book *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, cap. xi. and xii.<sup>o</sup>); but seemeth utterly inconsistent with the grounds which he stands upon against Pelagius. For, supposing contrariety and disorder in the motions of man's soul, what is there in this confusion which it hath created in the doings of mankind, that might not have come to pass without the fall? Unless we suppose, that a man can be reasonably mad: or that concupiscence, which reason boundeth not, could be contained within any rule or measure; not supposing any gift of God, enabling reason to give bounds to it, or preventing the effect of it, which the supposition of pure nature alloweth us not to suppose. For the very state of mortality, supposing the immortality of the soul, either requireth in man the conscience of integrity before God, or inferreth upon him a bad expectation for the world to come. And therefore,

<sup>1</sup> S. Thomas 1 part. quæst. 95. artic. 1. sic loquitur de rectitudine cum qua conditus fuit Adam: 'Manifestum,' inquit, 'est, quod illa subjectio corporis ad animam et inferiorum virium ad rationem non erat naturalis:' &c. "Ex hoc loco aperte discimus, hominem in puris naturalibus conditum habiturum fuisse rebellionem illam carnis ad Spiritum, quum nunc post amissum justitiæ originalis donum omnes experimur." Bellarm., De Grat. Primi Hominis, c. v.; Controv., tom. iii. pp. 17. D, 18. A. And see above in § 2. note n.

<sup>n</sup> *Retract.*, lib. i. c. ix. § 6; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 15. C: quoting the *De Lib. Arb.* as in next note, and adding in the beginning of the paragraph (*ibid.* A), "Ecce tam longe antequam Pelagiana hæresis extitisset, sic disputavimus, velut jam contra illos disputaremus."

<sup>o</sup> S. Aug., *De Lib. Arb.*, lib. iii. c. xx. § 56; *ibid.* tom. i. pp. 632. F, 633. A

<sup>o</sup> "Quamvis ergo in libro tertio de Libero Arbitrio ita de parvulis disputaverim, ut etiam si verum esset quod dicunt Pelagiani, ignorantiam et difficultatem, sine quibus nullus hominum nascitur, primordia, non supplicia esse naturæ; vincerentur tamen Manichæi," &c. S. Aug., *De Dono Persever.*, c. xi. § 27; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 835. E, F: quoting both the *Retractions* and the *De Libero Arbitrio*, as above in notes m, n.—"Ita in tertio libro de Libero Arbitrio secundum utrumque sensum restiti Manichæis, sive supplicia sive primordia naturæ sint ignorantia et difficultas, sine quibus nullus hominum nascitur; et tamen unum horum teneo. Ibi quoque a me satis evidenter expressum, quod non sit ista natura instituti hominis, sed pœna damnati." *Id.*, *De Dono Persev.*, c. xii. § 29; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 836. F. Thorndike seems hardly to allow due weight to the last words of this passage.

BOOK II. though the sorrows that bring death might serve for advantage to happiness, were reason able to govern passion in using them; yet, not being able, they can be nothing but essays of that displeasure of God, which he is to expect in the world to come. And therefore this escape of St. Augustin may seem to abate the zeal of those, who would make his opinion the rule of our common faith.

[Such a state possible as preparatory to the higher state of supernatural happiness.] § 25. That which my resolution inferreth, is no more than this; that, supposing God did not create man in an estate capable to attain the said supernatural happiness, He might nevertheless, had He pleased, have created him in an estate of immortality without impeachment of trouble or of sorrow; but not capable of further happiness than his then life in paradise upon earth importeth. Not that I intend to say, that God had been without any purpose of calling man, whom He had created in this state, unto the state of supernatural grace; whereby he might become capable of everlasting glory <sup>155</sup> in the world to come, as Christians believe themselves to be. <sup>bis</sup> For the meaning of those that suppose this, is, that God purposed to exercise man first in this lower estate, and having proved him and found him faithful in it (supposing Adam had not fallen), to have called him afterwards to a higher condition, of that immortality which we expect in the world to come, upon trial of fidelity in that obedience here, which is correspondent to it. Whereupon it is reasonably, though not necessarily, consequent, that, this calling being to be performed by the Word of God (Which being afterwards incarnate is our Lord Christ) and the Spirit which "dwelt in Him without measure," our Lord Christ should have come in our flesh, though Adam had not fallen, to do this. And this is alleged for a reason, why afterwards the law that was given to Moses covenanted expressly for no more than the happiness of this present life; though covertly, being joined with that discipline of godliness, which the people of God had received by tradition from their fathers, it afforded sufficient argument of the happiness of the world to come, for those who should embrace the worship of God in spirit and truth, though under the pædagogy and figures of the Law. For they say it is suitable to the proceeding of God in restoring mankind, that we understand Him first to intend

[John iii.  
34.]



the recovering of that natural integrity in which man was created, by calling His people to that uprightness of civil conversation in the service of the only true God, which might be a protection to as many as under the shelter of such civil laws should take upon them the profession of true righteousness to God; intending afterwards, by our Lord Christ, to set on foot a treaty of the said righteousness upon terms of happiness in the world to come<sup>p</sup>.

§ 26. But these things, though containing nothing prejudicial to Christianity, yet, not being grounded upon express Scripture, but collected by reasoning the ground and rule of God's purpose, which concerns not the truth of the Gospel whether so or not, I am neither obliged to admit nor refuse: so much of God's counsel remaining always visibly true, that He pleased to proceed by degrees in setting His Gospel on foot (by preparing His people for it by the discipline of the Law, and the insufficiency thereof, visible by that time which He intended for the coming of our Lord Christ), though we say that man was at first created in a state of supernatural grace, and capable of everlasting happiness; for still the reason of God's proceeding by degrees will be, that first there might be a time to try how great the disease was by the failing of the cure thereof by the Law, before so great a Physician as the Son of God came in person to visit it.

[These things only matters of inference, not grounded on express Scripture.]

§ 27. This only I must add, because all this discourse proceeds upon supposition, that man might have been created in an estate of mere nature, if endowed with uprightness capable to attain that happiness which that estate required; that, therefore, supposing man created to supernatural happiness, the supposition of pure nature, with that concupiscence, which the principles thereof (not prevented by any provision of God's to the contrary) would produce, is no way allowable. For who shall take upon him to charge God with laying an obligation of attaining supernatural happiness upon him, whom by inbred concupiscence He should make utterly unable to attain it?

§ 28. This being said, for the fuller understanding of the said opinion, I may now further take upon me, not only that

[Difference between natural and supernatural.]

<sup>p</sup> So Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. ii. c. 21, lib. iii. c. 2, lib. iv. c. 3; pp. 33—36, 66—71, 184: and elsewhere.

BOOK  
II.

by the resolution premised that endless dispute about the endowments which Adam was first created with, is easily determinable; but also there is a firm ground laid, upon which the difference between natural and supernatural may be settled among divines. For always, a state of mere nature being understood to be possible (whether we believe that man was actually settled in it or not), it is no hard matter to say, that whatsoever was requisite to enable man to live in obedience to God for the attaining of immortality in it, all this and nothing else is to be understood to be natural, as requisite to the endowment of man supposed to be set in that state; that, supernatural, which is requisite to the advancement of him to supernatural happiness, by enabling him to <sup>156</sup>tender unto God that spiritual obedience of righteousness <sup>his.</sup> and true holiness, to which he stands obliged by so high a calling. Whereupon, as (supposing that man was created to this happiness) it cannot be doubted that he stood endowed with capacities proportionable to that obedience which it requires, so, inasmuch as those capacities were not absolutely due to his nature (which might have been created in another estate), they are absolutely to be counted supernatural and of grace; but inasmuch as they depend upon a former grace of God, which is that gracious purpose of advancing man to a capacity of supernatural happiness, they may be counted due to his nature, not as necessary consequences of the constitution thereof, but of that estate which the free and gracious purpose of God designed for it. In the mean time, the contradiction between reason and sense being so consequent to the constitution of man's nature, that it was notwithstanding in God's appointment to prevent the coming of it to effect; and the obedience of God requiring that it should be prevented (man being otherwise unable perfectly to perform it, whether in the state of mere nature or grace); requisite it is, that the rebellion of the sensual appetite against the reason be accounted the consequence of his fall, not the condition in which he was created. And, upon these terms, it is easy to assign the difference between original uprightness and supernatural grace in Adam, supposing that he was created to supernatural happiness, and therefore in supernatural grace. For seeing man might have been created in



an estate of mere nature, in which, though destitute of grace, yet he had not been destitute of righteousness; though we suppose that he was indeed created in the state of grace, yet may we easily distinguish between that uprightness, which his nature necessarily required, and that spiritual holiness, whereby it stood advanced to that capacity of true happiness which God's free grace designed for it. And howsoever these terms may have been used among divines; yet, the occasion of misunderstanding them being thus cleared, nothing hinders the free gift by which it was advanced to be signified by the name of grace, the necessary uprightness of nature by the term of original righteousness.

§ 29. These things premised, it will be no difficult thing to resolve, that it is all one, whether we say that original sin is concupiscence, or that it is the want of original righteousness with concupiscence. For as in all actual or habitual sins (which, as more subject to sensible experience, are much better known to us) there is a want of straightness or uprightness, wherein their being sin consisteth, because the law of God traces us a straight way to walk, which they transgress; but there is also some action or habit wherein this crookedness is understood to subsist, though indeed (consisting in the mere want of uprightness) it subsisteth not at all, but is mere nothing<sup>a</sup>: so it is necessary to conceive something positive, to which the want of original righteousness may be attributed; neither can the nature of sin be understood in the state which we are born to, otherwise. And seeing the nature of original sin is necessarily habitual (because we have excluded the imputation of Adam's first sin<sup>b</sup>), it remains, that the appetite or inclination of nature to that which appeareth to be good, be the subject to which this perverseness is attributed, as subsisting in it. Now the appetite or inclination which we have to that which appears to be good, is not called concupiscence at large; unless we understand further, that it tendeth to enjoy that which of

Original  
sin is con-  
cupiscence.

<sup>a</sup> "Nihil est aliud peccatum nisi declinare ac recedere a regula." Bellarm., *De Amiss. Grat. et Statu Peccati*, lib. i. c. 1; *Controv.*, tom. iii. p. 71. A.—Sin is, according to one definition, "Carentia rectitudinis sive privatio conformitatis ad regulam." *Id.*,

*ibid.*, lib. v. c. 3; *ibid.*, p. 359. A.—"Peccatum nihil est, et nihil sunt homines cum peccant." S. Aug., *In Joh. Evang. Tract. i.* § 13; *Op.*, tom. iii. P. ii. p. 294. D.

<sup>b</sup> Above, § 6—8.

BOOK  
II.

itself is good, out of order, and without measure. For this inclination of the appetite, as no man will deny to be against God's law, that supposes it to be a straight rule, no more will he deny, that upon these suppositions it is properly called concupiscence. So that this one term of concupiscence expresseth as much, as the want of original uprightness with concupiscence, and giveth not that occasion of mistake which the using of more words doth: inasmuch as he that hears of the want of original righteousness with concupiscence, hath occasion to understand the want of uprightness and concupiscence to be two things; whereas indeed, as hath been said, there can be no more in the matter but only a positive inclination to things that appear good, deprived and destitute<sup>157</sup> of that order and measure which the law of God requireth.

[Confession of  
Augs-  
burg.]

§ 30. And herewith agrees that description of original sin in the Confession of Augsburg, which hath been the subject of so much debate among the divines of the empire\*: that "this want" of original righteousness "is a horrible blindness and disobedience; which is, to be destitute of that light and knowledge of God which should have been in man's nature remaining entire, to be destitute of that uprightness, which consists in perpetual obedience, in true, pure, and sovereign love of God, and the like gifts of entire nature<sup>t</sup>." For let no man think them so simple as to imagine, that original sin consists in actual ignorance and actual hatred and disobedience to God; which are themselves no ways original, but acknowledge a source from whence they proceed. But, desiring to make their meaning more palpable to gross understandings, they were not afraid to incur an exception, which the captious might make; as if they understood no difference between those consequences and productions, whereby it becomes visible, and the source of them, which the question properly concerns.

\* See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist., Bk. iv. Sect. iii. Pt. ii. c. 1. § 31—34: and the works of Mathias Flacius Illyricus and his opponents on the subject of original sin.

<sup>t</sup> "Estque defectus" (viz. "defectus justitiæ, seu integritatis, seu obedientiæ originalis") "horribilis cæcitas et inobedientiæ, scilicet carere illa luce ac

notitia Dei, quæ fuerat futura in natura integra, item carere illa rectitudine, hoc est, perpetua obedientia, vera, pura ac summa dilectione Dei, et similibus donis integræ naturæ." Conf. Augustana (as printed at Witteberg in 1540), in Artic. Fidei Præcipuis, ii.



§ 31. For as concerning ignorance, and being destitute of that light and knowledge of God, which the state of uprightness must have enjoyed; I find no necessity to think, that Adam upon his fall was actually deprived of the habitual knowledge of those truths, which were settled in his mind concerning God, or of those images in the mind, or conceptions of the mind, wherein that knowledge did consist, as all knowledge doth. It is enough, and more than enough, that the poison wherewith his inclinations and appetites stood now so perverted, suffered not that truth which enlightened his mind to have effect in his actions; according to that which Christians, being by the grace of God restored to the like light, do find in themselves by sad experience. And when, in process of time, his posterity, notwithstanding the instruction which they received of him for above nine hundred years together, and notwithstanding the preaching of the godly fathers (which St. Jude in his Epistle exemplifieth of Enoch, and St. Peter of Noe, 2 Pet. ii. 5), fell away not only to oppression and wickedness but to the worship of false gods; then it appeared, how natural this blindness is to the posterity of Adam having departed from God, concupiscence prevailing to make such strange and horrible ignorance take place in the minds of them, who had such certain and evident information from their predecessors, of God that made them and all the world for their benefit, of His severe judgment upon the fall of Adam, and mercy promised, and judgment preached against them that should refuse it.

§ 32. To the difficulty, then, which causeth this whole dispute, I will answer otherwise than they which have not been able to take it away have done:—that, all sin being a transgression of God's law, if there be several laws by which God deals with mankind, there must be also several rules and several measures; by which that which is sin according to the original law, may not be sin according to the latter law, which necessarily derogateth from that which went afore. The original rule of righteousness, which the light which man was created in obliged him to, must needs detect and convince the eternal inclination of concupiscence, and much more the transgressions of the same, to be sin against

BOOK II. God. And seeing the very same motions are seen in that conflict between the flesh and the spirit, which the most regenerate find in themselves, though by the grace of God's Spirit in them they prevail not (so that there is no difference for nature and kind, but only for efficacy and strength, between the concupiscence which remains in the regenerate, and that which rules in the unregenerate); there can no controversy remain among Christians, that there is an original law of God, which this defect of original righteousness violateth. And seeing Christianity obligeth to mortify concupiscence, and to prevent rather than to suppress the first motions of it; of necessity, the rule of our conversation is grounded upon that uprightness, in which or to which Adam was created. But not therefore the rule of God's proceeding with us, whose salvation His mercy designeth, supposing concupiscence. And if there be a latter law of God, derogatory to that original law, according to which He dealeth with<sup>158</sup> those that are under it by embracing the covenant of grace: it cannot be said, that the transgression of God's original law is any sin against it; being tendered to those, whom God knows, that so long as they live in the world, they cannot be void of concupiscence. So that, by virtue of that law, according to which God by His Gospel declares that He will deal with those that embrace Christianity, well may it be said, that original sin is utterly defaced by baptism: though in relation to that original rule of righteousness, which man's uprightness obligeth him to, it is most truly said, that concupiscence is original sin.

§ 33. And though, supposing this answer, it seems to me evidently unnecessary, if not evidently contradictory to itself, and to the justice, goodness, and holiness of God, to have recourse to a state of mere nature; as if man might have been created in it, supposing him designed by God to a state of supernatural happiness: yet it is as evident to me, that it is no error of the foundation of faith, but only in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and the skill of divines. For, supposing the belief of original sin on the one side, on the other side remission of sin by the profession of Christianity, which baptism executeth and solemnizeth; he that fails in giving account how these things may stand together, and be



both true at once, cannot be thought to fail of that faith, which he maintains not with good success. There may be as great a failure on the other side, in not believing the efficacy of Christianity in the remission of sin. Neither can the decree of the council of Trent<sup>u</sup>, couched in the proper and formal terms of St. Augustin<sup>v</sup> (that concupiscence in the regenerate is not truly and properly sin, but so called because proceeding from sin and tending to sin), be condemned as absolutely false; so long as there is a new law of God, which is the covenant of grace, against which it is no sin, being tendered and made after it, and supposing it. Nor could the mouth of Pelagius have been stopped, when the efficacy of baptism in the remission of sin was received among all Christians according to the primitive and original truth of Christianity; were there not some true and just ground, upon which it may be said, that the opposition of concupiscence after baptism to the law of God remaineth no more. And yet that is no less true, which the same Augustin in divers other places affirmeth, either expressly, or by good consequence<sup>w</sup>; that concupiscence, which remains after baptism, is original sin: to wit, according to the original law of God, tendered to the original institution of man's nature. If therefore that be true which Dr. Field<sup>x</sup> saith, that all the errors of the Church of Rome concerning the

CHAP.  
XX.

<sup>u</sup> See it above in § 4. note s.

<sup>v</sup> "Peccatum dicitur (concupiscentia), quia peccato facta est, appetitque peccare." S. Aug., *Opus Imperf. cont. Julian.*, lib. i. c. lxxi.; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 915. E.—"Ipsa quidem concupiscentia jam non est peccatum in regeneratis, quando illi ad illicita opera non consentitur, atque ut ea perpetrent, a regina mente membra non dantur. . . Sed quia modo quodam loquendi peccatum vocatur, quod et peccato facta est et peccatum si vicerit facit; reatus ejus valet in generato, quem reatum Christi gratia per remissionem omnium peccatorum in regenerato, si ad mala opera ei quodam modo jubenti non obediatur, valere non sinit." Id., *De Nupt. et Concup.*, lib. i. c. xxiii. § 25; *ibid.*, p. 293. B, C.—See also *Cont. Duas Epist. Pelagian.*, lib. i. c. xlii. § 27; *ibid.*, p. 423. C—E.—*Cont. Julian.*, lib. ii. c. ix. § 32; *ibid.*, p. 547.

F.—*Opus Imperf. cont. Julian.*, lib. ii. c. cccxvi.; *ibid.*, p. 1047. B, C.—And Bellarm., *De Amis. Grat. et Statu Pecc.*, lib. v. c. 8; *Controv.*, tom. iii. pp. 387. D—389. B.

<sup>w</sup> "Apostolus . . . peccatum esse concupiscentiam satis omnino monstravit, ubi ait, 'Peccatum non cognovi nisi per Legem, nam concupiscentiam nesciebam, nisi Lex diceret, Non concupisces.'" S. Aug., *Op. Imperf. cont. Julian.*, lib. iii. c. ccc.; *Op.*, tom. x. p. 1132. F.—"Ecce de qua (libidine) trahitur originale peccatum." Id., *ibid.*, lib. ii. c. xlii.; *ibid.*, p. 972. D.—"Ex hoc concupiscentia, suscepta tua . . . generatione, trahitur originalis peccati vinculum, sola regeneratione solvendum." Id., *ibid.*, c. cccxviii. p. 1041. E, F.—So also *ibid.*, lib. vi. c. xli.; *ibid.*, p. 1382. D, E: and elsewhere.

<sup>x</sup> See above, § 3. note p.

BOOK  
II.

covenant of grace have their original from this error concerning the state of pure nature (as, perhaps, they may better be said to proceed from not distinguishing the several consequences of God's several laws); it will nevertheless be very fit to be considered, whether those errors which are grounded upon a mistake in divinity, do amount to any denial of the foundation of faith.

§ 34. For supposing for the present (though not granting) the supposition of mere nature (that is, that God might have made man, though instituted to supernatural happiness, with concupiscence) to be possible; it may be nevertheless, and is without doubt, utterly useless for a reason, why the righteousness of a Christian is accepted by God as the fulfilling of His law towards the reward of everlasting happiness, notwithstanding concupiscence: for which it would be very impertinent to allege, that God might have made man with concupiscence, and therefore accepts the obedience of those that are under it; because it is manifest, that the perfection to which Christianity calleth, is that to which Adam was instituted in paradise. It is therefore, by consequence, no less impertinent to the nature of original sin, that God might have made man from the beginning with concupiscence. For original sin must, of necessity, be that evil which we are born with in consideration of Adam's sin. And therefore, whatsoever we might have been born with,<sup>159</sup> seeing that actually and *de facto* we are born with concupiscence in consideration of Adam's sin, who otherwise should have been born with that uprightness in which he was made, original sin must needs be that which we are now born with; though, supposing that we had been originally made with it, it had not been original sin. For the absurdity of this consequence tends to shew, that the supposition of mere nature is impossible; and presses not me, which believe it so to be.

Concern-  
ing the late  
novelty in  
the Church  
of England  
about ori-  
ginal sin.

§ 35. And now, to that novelty in the doctrine of the Church of England that hath caused so much offence<sup>y</sup> (because, allowing some points of it not to prejudice the common faith, it is requisite, that I freely distinguish myself from that which I allow not), I say briefly; that i

<sup>y</sup> "Dr. Taylor." Added in marg. in MS.—See above, c. 3



cellent doctor, and those who find themselves offended at his doctrine, will give me leave to interpret one point, to distinguish one term of his opinion, I shall heartily wish that the offence thereof may cease. It is in that he saith, that concupiscence was before the fall, though much increased by it<sup>z</sup>: and I would have it said, that all the inclinations of the sensual appetite were before the fall, but the disorder of them, seeking satisfaction without rule or measure, by it; the word concupiscence being capable of both significations. For it is manifest, that Adam, as we do, consisted of flesh and spirit (taking flesh for the substance, not the perverse inclination of the flesh, and spirit for the substance of his own, not the grace of God's Spirit), of soul and body, of a spiritual and carnal substance: the appetite of the principal part tending to that, which is excellent by nature; but the baser part having an appetite proper to the nature of it, whereof reason, from which all order, rule, and measure proceeds, is no ingredient. But it is necessary to say, that God, Who requires the sensual appetite to be subject to the principal part of the soul, as the reason to God, had provided such an estate for such a creature, wherein it might be in the power of reason to give order, rule, and measure to the motions of the sensual appetite. Otherwise, the mortifying of concupiscence being the work of Christianity, it will necessarily follow, that the coming of Christ was to furnish that grace, by which Christians may mortify that which God had created; which our common faith admitteth not. And therefore it is no otherwise to be admitted, that concupiscence is increased by the fall of Adam, than as that may be said to be increased, which being moderate afore is since become immoderate.

CHAP.  
XX.

[How concupiscence caused or changed by the fall.]

\* "I add this also, that concupiscence is not wholly an effect of Adam's sin; if it were, then it would follow, that if Adam had not sinned we should have no concupiscence, that is, no contrary appetites; which is infinitely confuted by the experience of Adam's fall: for by the rebellion and prevailing of his concupiscence it was that he fell, and that which was the cause, could not be the effect of the same thing; as no child can beget his own father, nor anything which it leads and draws in

1. it is

true that by Adam's sin this became much worse, and by the evils of the body and its infirmities, and the nakedness of the soul as well as the body, and new necessities and new emergencies, . . . this I say became much worse, and more inordinate and tempted and vexed, and we were more under the devil's power, because we had the less of our own." Jer. Taylor, Doctr. and Practice of Repent., c. vii. Further Explic. of Orig. Sin, Sect. ii. § 11: Works, vol. ix. p. 83. And see also *ibid.*, c. vi. sect. i. § 22; *ibid.*, p. 12.

BOOK  
II.

For seeing that concupiscence, being once free of the command of reason and the rule and measure which it might have from thence, can have no other bounds than those, which in this estate it acknowledgeth (which is, to be utterly boundless, so far as it is consistent with itself, and as the satisfaction of several passions appears not incompatible); there is no reason, why it should be ascribed to the fall, once granting it to be the condition of God's creature; which, without the fall, must needs have profited to that horrible confusion in human affairs, the contrariety whereof to the excellence of man's nature reason discerns: and, therefore, religion reasonably introduces the fall, to give a reason for it. If the supposition of pure nature would endure, that man, though created liable to concupiscence, by virtue of some contrary endowment might be preserved from the effect of it; and that the effect of Adam's fall were to make that frustrate and void: I should not think that supposition any way prejudicial to the Christian faith. But in regard that the supposition admitteth no such endowment (because it must be a gift of grace, which would destroy the supposition of mere nature), therefore it is denied, that God, supposing that integrity in Adam which the Christian faith requireth, could create him in this state of mere nature. If this doctor had said, or could have said, that concupiscence, being a natural consequence of man's composition, was prevented of coming to act and effect by eating the fruit of the tree of life, ordained to that purpose; that "the leaves" thereof were, in this regard, "healing to the nations;" and that the grace of Christ was dispensed by that means in that estate, as now by the sacrament of the eucharist: I might say, this were a novelty among divines, but I could not say that it were destructive to the faith. But if the coming of Christ be not to repair the fall of the first Adam, I cannot see how the faith is secure. 160

[In what sense concupiscence is sin.]

§ 36. As for the term of sin, when he denieth that this concupiscence can be properly sin, which is neither the act of sin, nor any propensity created by custom of sinning, but bred in our nature<sup>a</sup>, whereof there is no other instance but

<sup>a</sup> "Concupiscence . . is not a sin to all persons, not to unconsenting persons: for if it be no sin to them that resist, then, neither is it a sin to them



itself; I confess, when the question comes to the signification of words, and the property of it (which may always be endless, because the question is only, whether my sense shall give law to your language or your sense to mine, which it is not necessary to insist upon, when the faith is secured on both sides), I count it always hard, to charge an error in the substance of faith. Now, whether we say this concupiscence is sin or not, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ His coming, and the end of it, remains always the same; and so the necessity of His grace is settled upon the right bottom.

§ 37. And truly, if we recollect the language which is used by the Greek fathers, and those that lived before Pelagius, comparing it with that which hath been used since St. Austin, we shall not find the term of original sin so frequent as the ground of it. For not only death and the sorrows that bring it, but even the inclination of our nature to actual sin, is by them ascribed to the fall, who use not the term of original sin. As every one, that peruseth but the terms of those passages of the fathers, which this doctor hath produced<sup>b</sup>, may easily perceive.

[Language of the Greek fathers and of those that lived before Pelagius.]

that cannot consent. But it hath 'the nature of sin,' that is, it is the material part of sin, a principle and root from whence evil may spring, according to St. Austin's words: 'Modo quodam loquendi vocatur peccatum, quod peccato factum est, et peccati, si vicerit, facit reum.' Just as if a man have a natural thirst, it may tempt him, and is apt to incline him to drunkenness," &c. "But because this can be there where damnation shall not enter, this nature of sin is such as does not make a proper guiltiness." Jer. Taylor, *ibid.*, sect. vi. § 40: *ibid.*, p. 117. And see also his Answ. to a Letter touching Orig. Sin, *ibid.*, p. 391.

<sup>b</sup> "Τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν ἀρχήθεν ἀπὸ τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν ἀνοήτως ἐξολισθήσασαν ἢ πολυκαθεστᾶτη ζωῇ διαδέχεται καὶ τὸ τοῦ φθοροποιοῦ θανάτου πέρασ." Dion. Areop., *Ecel. Hierarch.*, c. iii. P. iii. § 11; *Op.*, tom. i. p. 296. Antv. 1634.—"Τὸν Ἀδὰμ, δι' ὃν ἁμαρτωλοὶ γεγονότες τεθνήκαμεν." Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox., Resp. ad Qu. cii.; in Append. ad Op. S. Just. Mart., P. i. p. 183. C.—"Οὐδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι Αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, ὡς ἐνδεῆς τούτων, ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ

γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἐπὶ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τῆς ὕφους ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκαστον αὐτῶν πονηρευσάμενον." S. Just. Mart., *Dial. cum Tryph. Jud.*, c. 88; *Op.*, p. 186. A.—"Διὰ δὲ τῆς παρακοῆς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐξήντηλσε πόνον, δόνην, λύπην, καὶ τὸ τέλος ἐπὶ θάνατον ἔπεσε." Theophil. Antioch., *Ad Autolyc.*, lib. ii. c. 35. p. 184.—"Per quem (Satanam) homo a primordio circumventus, ut præceptum Dei excederet, et propterea in mortem datus, exinde totum genus, de suo semine infectum, suæ etiam damnationis traducem fecit." Tertull., *De Testim. Animæ adv. Gentes*, c. iii.; *Op.*, p. 66. B.—St. Cyprian "calls original sin," "Contagium mortis antiquæ prima natiuitate contractum." *Epist. ad Fidum*, *Epist. 64.* p. 161.—"Οἱ γεγονότες ἐξ αὐτοῦ" (Adam), "ὡς ἀπὸ φθαρτοῦ φθαρτοὶ γεγόναμεν." S. Cyril. Alexand., *Adv. Anthrop.*, c. viii.; *Op.*, tom. vi. p. 375. E.—And so also S. Chrysostom and Theodoret (see below, notes f—i), and others; quoted by Taylor, *Doctr. and Pract. of Repent.*, c. vii. sect. v. § 18—22; *Works*, vol. ix. pp. 94—102; and c. iv. sect. i. § 19; *ibid.*, pp. 9, 10.

- BOOK II. § 38. Upon these terms Clemens Alexandrinus is no interruption to the tradition of original sin; in that difficult place, *Strom.* iii., that made Vossius say he "understood it not<sup>c</sup>." He speaks against those that condemned marriage.
- [Clemens Alexandrinus.] "Δεγέτωσαν ἡμῖν ποῦ ἐπόρνευσεν τὸ γεννηθὲν παιδίον; ἢ πῶς ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑποπέπτωκεν ἄρὰν τὸ μηθὲν ἐνεργήσαν;"
- ["αὐτοῖς"] ἀπολείπεται δὲ αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀκολουθῶς λέγειν τὴν γένεσιν εἶναι κακὴν, οὐ τὴν τοῦ σώματος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς, δι' ἣν καὶ τὸ σῶμα. καὶ ὅταν ὁ Δαβὶδ εἴπῃ·
- [Ps. li. 5.] Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἀνομίαις ἐκίσσησέν με ἡ μήτηρ μου· λέγει μὲν προφητικῶς μητέρα τὴν Εὐαν. ἀλλὰ ζώντων
- [Gen. iii. 20.] Εὐα μήτηρ ἐγένετο. καὶ εἰ ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ συνελήφθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ, οὐδὲ μὴν ἁμαρτία αὐτός. εἰ δὲ καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστρέφων ἐξ ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἀπὸ τῆς συνηθείας τῆς ἁμαρτωλοῦ οἶον μητρὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἐπιστρέφει, μαρ-
- [Micah vi. 7.] τυρήσει μοι εἰς τῶν ἱβ προφητῶν φήσας· Εἰ δῶ πρωτότοκα ὑπὲρ ἀσεβείας, καρπὸν κοιλίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου; οὐ διαβάλλει τὸν εἰπόντα· Αὐξάνετε καὶ πληθύνεσθε· ἀλλὰ τὰς πρώτας ἐκ γενέσεως ὁρμᾶς, καθ' ἃς Θεὸν οὐ γινώσκομεν, ἀσεβείας λέγει."—"Let them tell us where the child that is born committed whoredom? or how it fell under the curse of Adam, that had done nothing? It remains, as it seems, that they say, that the generation is evil, not only of the body, but of
- [Ps. li. 5.] the soul, for which the body is. And when David saith, I was conceived in sins, and in iniquities did my mother lust with me; like a prophet he calls Eve his mother: but Eve
- [Gen. iii. 20.] was the mother of the living; and though conceived in sin, yet was not he in sin, or sinful. But whether every one that turns from sin to faith, turn from sinful custom, as from his mother, to life, one of the twelve prophets will be my witness,
- [Micah vi. 7.] saying, Shall I give my first-born for impiety, the fruit of my belly for the sin of my soul? He traduceth not him that said,
- [Gen. i. 22, 28.] Increase and multiply; but he calleth the first inclinations from our birth, by which we are ignorant of God, impieties<sup>d</sup>." He saith, most truly, that they cannot render a reason how we are born under Adam's curse, but by charging God. He

<sup>c</sup> "Propter hæc diffiteri non possumus Clementem Alexandrinum non satis intellexisse peccatum originale." Voss., *Hist. Pelag.*, lib. ii. P. i. Thes. 6;

Op., tom. vi. pp. 607. b, 608. a. See Jer. Taylor, *Doctr. and Pract. of Repent.*, c. vii., as quoted in note b, p. 98.

<sup>d</sup> *Strom.*, lib. iii. c. 16. pp. 556, 557,



granteth actual sin in conception, but that, not the sin of the child that is conceived. He saith, the custom of sin may be our mother Eve, in the mystical sense of David; but he ascribeth it to those first motions from our birth, which make mankind ignorant of God, till they turn to Christianity. Whether this be my plea or no, let him that hath perused the premises judge.

§ 39. The<sup>e</sup> same is to be said of St. Chrysostom in his homily *ad Neophytos*<sup>f</sup>; denying, that infants are baptized because they are polluted with sin: to wit, that he appropriateth the name of sin to actual sin. But, as Clemens acknowledges the first motions that we have from our birth to tend to ignorance of God; so St. Chrysostom, *Hom. xi. in vi. ad Rom.*<sup>g</sup>, *Hom. xiii. in vii. ad Rom.*<sup>h</sup>, clearly ascribes the coming in of concupiscence to Adam's sin, or rather to the sentence of mortality inflicted by God upon it: wherein he is followed by Theodoret, *In v. ad Rom.*<sup>i</sup>, observing, that the want of things necessary to the sustenance of our mortality 161 provokes excesses, and that sins. If this reason can generally hold, so that all concupiscence may be said to be the consequence of mortality, Christianity will be sound; the necessity of Christ's coming for the repair of Adam's fall remaining the same. But this is the reason why the same St. Chrysostom, *Hom. x. in vi. ad Rom.*<sup>k</sup>, when St. Paul saith, [St. Chrysostom.]  
"By one man's disobedience many are made sinners," un- [Rom. v. 19.]

<sup>e</sup> Corrected from MS. "this" in orig. text.

<sup>f</sup> "Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato, ut eis addatur sanctitas, justitia, adoptio, hæreditas, fraternitas Christi, at Ejus membr sint." S. Chrys., *Hom. ad Neophytos*, as quoted in S. Aug., *Cont. Julian. Pelag.*, lib. i. c. vi. § 21 (*Op.*, tom. x. p. 509. F); from Julian. The homily exists in Latin only (p. 51. l. B. in *Append. ad tom. ii. Op. S. Chrys. ed. Fronto Ducæus Paris. 1621*): but St. Augustin does not dispute the genuineness of either the homily or the passage quoted from it. It is omitted both by Savile and by the Benedictine editor of St. Chrysostom; but Cave appears to consider it genuine.

<sup>g</sup> "Μετὰ γὰρ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ πολλὰς παθῶν ἐπεισῆλθεν ἐσμός." S. Chrys., *Hom. xi. in vi. ad Rom.*, v. 14, § 3; *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 534. D. ed. Bened.

<sup>h</sup> "Μετὰ γὰρ τοῦ θανάτου, φησί, καὶ δὲ τῶν παθῶν ἐπεισῆλθεν ὄχλος· ὅτε γὰρ θνητὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σῶμα, ἐδέξατο καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν ἀναγκαίως λοιπὸν, καὶ ὀργὴν καὶ λύπην, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα, ἃ πολλῆς ἐδεῖτο φιλοσοφίας· ἵνα μὴ πλημύραντα ἐν ἡμῖν καταποντίσῃ λόγισμον εἰς τὴν ἁμαρτίας βυθόν· αὐτὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν ἁμαρτία, ἣ δὲ ἀμερτία αὐτῶν μὴ χαλινουμένη τοῦτο εἰργάζετο." Id., *Hom. xiii. in vii. ad Rom.*, v. 14, § 1; *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 557. D, E.

<sup>i</sup> *Op.*, tom. iii. pp. 41. D, 42. A.

<sup>k</sup> "Τί οὖν ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἁμαρτωλοῖ; Ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τὸ ὑπεύθυνον κολάσει, καὶ καταδεδικασμένοι θανάτῳ. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἀποθανόντος πάντες ἐγενόμεθα θνητοί, σαφῶς καὶ διὰ πολλῶν ἔδειξε" (viz., St. Paul). S. Chrys., *Hom. x. in v. ad Rom.*, v. 19, § 3; *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 523. B. The latter and greater portion of the Homily is on *Rom. vi.*

BOOK  
II.

derstandeth by "sinners," liable to death; concupiscence, wherein original sin consisteth, as I have shewed<sup>1</sup>, being the consequence of mortality, according to St. Chrysostom.

[Zuingli's doctrine.]

§ 40. As for those that censure books at Oxford<sup>m</sup>, if they like not this, I demand but one thing, what they think of Zuinglius his writings. For I suppose, none of them believes, that Zuinglius holds original sin to be properly sin<sup>n</sup>; or that infants are damned for it<sup>o</sup> (though, whether they come to everlasting life or no, notwithstanding their concupiscence which they are born with, I find not that he saith). Let them therefore choose, whether they will censure Zuinglius his books, or profess that they "have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons."

[James ii. 1.]

[The dispute turns upon a difference of language.]

§ 41. And therefore I do not understand, why I should make any more of this difference of language, than of that which was on foot in the ancient Church about the term of "*Hypostasis*" in the Blessed Trinity, among those who heartily adhered to the faith of the Church. And, I conceive, I may compare it with the difference between the Latin and the Greek Church about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, whether 'from the Father and the Son,' or 'from the Father by the Son.' For though I do believe with the western Church, that He proceedeth from Both;

<sup>1</sup> Above, § 29.

<sup>m</sup> "Dr. Owen laboured a censure of Dr. T.'s book to the Countess of Devonshire, suppressed by her." Added in margin in MS. Dr. John Owen was the puritan Dean of Christ Church, appointed by Cromwell and the Parliament in 1651.

<sup>n</sup> "Sic ergo diximus originale contagionem morbum esse, non peccatum, quod peccatum cum culpa conjunctum est; culpa vero ex commissio vel admissio ejus nascitur qui facinus designavit." Zuingl., Declar. de Pecc. Orig. ad Urban. Rhesium (Op., tom. ii. p. 116. a. Tigur. 1539).—"Summa vero omnium quæ in libello de Peccato Originali conscripto docemus, hæc est: Quod nimirum originalis ista contagio non tale peccatum sit quod culpam sibi conjunctam habeat, sed morbus potius, qui propter peccatum ab Adamo commissum nobis adhærere solet. Nec tamen obstat quominus peccati nomen morbus iste accipiat," &c. Id., Ad Confess. D. Martin. Luther. Respons.

P. iii.; *ibid.*, p. 517. a.—See also his tract De Baptism., Tract. iii. De Pædo-bapt.; *ibid.*, p. 89. b.

<sup>o</sup> "Hinc constat, si in Christo secundo Adam vitæ restituimur, quemadmodum in primo Adam sumus morti traditi, quod temere damnamus Christianis parentibus natos pueros, imo gentium quoque pueros. Adam enim si perdere universum genus peccando potuit, et Christus moriendo non vivificavit et redemit universum genus a clade per istum data, jam non est pars salus reddita per Christum; et perinde (quod absit) nec verum, 'Sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, ita in Christo omnes vitæ restituantur.' Verum quomodocunque de gentiliū infantibus statuendum sit, hoc certe adseveramus, propter virtutem salutis per Christum præstitæ, præter rem pronuntiare qui eos æternæ maledictioni addicunt," &c. Id., Ad Carol. Imperat. Fidei Ratio; *ibid.*, p. 540. a. See also his Elench. cont. Catabaptistas; *ibid.*, p. 35. b.



yet, the eastern Church acknowledging (as it doth) 'from the Father by the Son,' if it had been in me, the matter should never have come to a breach in the Church about that difference. Even so, the term of original sin being received in the western Church, to exclude the heresy of Pelagius; I do not intend to take offence at the using, or give offence by the refusing, of it. But I shall not therefore condemn those times or persons of the Church that used it not, as unsound or defective in the faith; the tradition whereof is not to be derived, but by that which all parts agree in professing.

§ 42. As for the punishment of everlasting torments upon infants that depart with it, it is a thing utterly past my capacity to understand, how it concerns the necessity of Christ's coming, that those infants who are not cured by it, should be thought liable to them. Would His death be in vain, would the grace which it purchaseth be unnecessary, unless those infants that have committed no actual sin "go into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels?" Shall the corruption of our nature by the fall of Adam be counted a fable, unless I be able to maintain that infants are there, or shew where they are if not there? Or will any man undertake to shew me that consent of the whole Church in this point, which is visible by the premises as concerning that corruption of nature, which I challenge to be matter of faith? It is not to be denied, that St. Augustin<sup>p</sup>, and enow after him, have maintained it; and perhaps thought, that the faith cannot be maintained otherwise. But can that therefore be the tradition of the whole Church, which doctors allowed by the Church do not believe? In this, as in other instances, we see a difference between matters of faith and ecclesiastical doctrines; of which you have a book of Gennadius entitled

CHAP.  
XX.

[Unbaptized infants, whether saved or not.]

[Matt. xxv. 41.]

<sup>p</sup> "Nec est ullus ulli medius locus, ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo. Hinc et Ipse Dominus, volens auferre de cordibus male credentium istam nescio quam medietatem, quam conantur quidam parvulis non baptizatis tribuere, ut quasi merito innocentiae sint in vita aeterna, sed quia non sunt baptizati, non sint cum Christo in regno Eius, definitivam pro-

tulit ad hæc ora obstruenda sententiam, ubi ait, 'Qui non est Mecum, contra Me est.' " S. Aug., De Merit. et Remiss. Peccator., lib. i. c. 28. § 55; Op., tom. x. p. 30. D, E.—And see Bramhall's Works, vol. v. pp. 178—180. Oxf. 1845: and Jer. Taylor, Doct. and Pract. of Repent., c. vii. sect. iv. § 16; Works, vol. ix. pp. 90, 91.

BOOK II. *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*<sup>a</sup>. For such positions as pass

without offence, when they are held and professed by such as enjoy the communion of the Church (or more than so, rank of authority in it), must necessarily be counted doctrines of the Church. And yet, if it appear, that the contrary hath been held other whiles and elsewhere, they do not oblige our belief as matters of faith.

[The ninth article.]

§ 43. As for the article of the Church of England, which ascribeth the desert of "God's wrath and damnation" to original sin; I conceive it is always the duty of every son of the Church, so to interpret, so to limit or to extend the acts<sup>162</sup> of the Church of England, that is, the sense of them, that it may agree with the faith of the Catholic Church: because all such acts serve, and are to serve, only to maintain the Church of England a member thereof, by maintaining the faith of it. How much more at this time; that unity and communion, which these acts tended to maintain amongst ourselves, being irrecoverably violated, by men equally concerned in the cherishing of it. For, admitting the faith and the laws of the primitive Church, what can any Church allege, why they are not one with us? Not admitting them, what can we allege, why we are not one with others? It followeth therefore of necessity, that "the wrath of God and damnation," which original sin deserveth according to the article of the Church of England, be confined to the loss and coming short of that salvation, to which the first Adam being appointed, the second Adam hath restored us; there being no more to be had, either by necessary consequence from the Scripture, or by tradition from the whole Church. For to require me to believe them to be in the torments "prepared for the devil and his angels," because I cannot say where they are, were a reason too unreasonable for a Christian.

<sup>a</sup> Gennadii Massiliensis Presbyteri Liber de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus: in Append. ad Op. S. Augustini, tom.

viii. pp. 75—80; and edited separately by Elmenhorst, 4to. Hamburg. 1614.











3 2044 035 017 540

